Arch. Mong.

AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Vol. III.] (MONTHLY) [1890.

EDITED BY REV. H. J. HEUSER,

Professor of Exegesis and Introd. to S. Script., Theol. Seminary, Overbrook.

"*Ut Ecclesia ædificationem accipiat.*"
1. Cor. xiv. 5.

LIBRARY
MENLO PARK.
ST. PATRICK'S SEMINARY.

FR. PUSTET & CO.,
NEW YORK & CINCINNATI.

COPYRIGHT
BY
E. STEINBACK,
1890.

American Ecclesiastical Review.

VOL. III.

CONTENTS.

JULY.

I. THE LITURGIES OF THE EAST, - - - - - 1
II. ON THE EVE OF CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE, - - - 16
III. THE STUDY OF THE CHRISTIAN FATHERS, - - 28
IV. THE RIGHTS OF PRIESTS HONORABLY RETIRED, 38
V. INFANTES SINE BAPTISMO DECEDENTES, - - 44
VI. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF MORAL THEOLOGY, - - - - - - - - - 48
TITULAR FEASTS, etc.

AUGUST.

I. VARIATIONS IN THE RITES OF THE CHURCH, - 81
II. PERSONAL CHARACTER OF MGR. CORCORAN, - 97
III. THE PRIEST AND THE MEDICAL PROFESSION, - 107
IV. LETTERS TO A RELIGIOUS, ON ART, - - - - 113
V. LANDMARKS IN THE STUDY OF PATROLOGY, - 119
VI. IGNORANCE OF A RESERVED CASE ON THE PART OF THE PENITENT, - - - - - - - - 128
TITULAR FEASTS, etc.

SEPTEMBER.

I. THE CHALICE, - - - - - - - 161
II. VOCATIONS TO THE PRIESTHOOD AND OUR SEMINARIES, - - - - - - - - - - 169
III. THE OFFERTORY IN THE MISSA DE REQUIE, - 185

IV. LETTERS TO A RELIGIOUS, ON ART, - - - 192
V. THE MORAL LIMIT IN THE USE OF ANÆSTHETICS, 198
VI. HYMNS OF THE LITTLE HOURS, - - - - - 204
VII. EXAMEN PRO BACCAL. IN S. THEOL., IN UNIVERSITATE CATHOLICA, - - - - - - - 210
TITULAR FEASTS, etc.

OCTOBER.

I. THE JEW JOSEPHUS AS A WITNESS TO CHRIST, - 241
II. THE SODALITY OF CHRISTIAN MOTHERS IN OUR PARISHES, - - - - - - - - - 251
III. HYPNOTISM AND THEOLOGY, - - - - - 257
IV. THE SHEPHERD, - - - - - - - - 272
V. REFLECTIONS OF A PRIEST ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION, - - - - - - - - - - 277
VI. LETTERS TO A RELIGIOUS, ON ART, - - - 286
VII. PROCURATOR FISCALIS, - - - - - 291
TITULAR FEASTS, etc.

NOVEMBER.

I. THE GENTLEMANLINESS OF ST. PAUL, - - - 321
II. THE ASPERGES, - - - - - - - - - 133
III. THE SCIENCE OF THEOLOGY, - - - - - 341
IV. THE ARCHCONFRATERNITY OF CHRISTIAN MOTHERS, - - - - - - - - - - - 352
V. THE IMPRIMATUR, - - - - - - - - 357
VI. LETTERS TO A RELIGIOUS, ON ART, - - - 361
TITULAR FEASTS, etc.

DECEMBER.

I. THE FINAL ADVENT, - - - - - - - - 401
II. THE "CORPORALE" AND "PALLA," - - - 417
III. COMPULSORY EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 420
IV. SEDULIUS AND HIS ABECEDARY, - - - - 435
V. LETTERS TO A RELIGIOUS, ON ART, - - - 450
TITULAR FEASTS, etc.

AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. III.—JULY, 1890.—NO. 1.

THE LITURGIES OF THE EAST.

TO the Visitor at Rome no season of the year offers so many interesting features from an ecclesiastical point of view as that of Christmas. The ceremonies of the Church are carried out with a pomp and splendor aptly portraying the joyous appreciation in which she holds that exceeding great gift which the divine mercy has bestowed upon the world in the Incarnation of the Son of God. But of all others the beautiful Church of *S. Andrea della Valle* becomes the centre of attraction to the foreigner. Here not only sermons may be heard in different languages and by eminent preachers of all nationalities, but a strange ritual takes the place of the Roman. Here the sacred mysteries are on succeeding days celebrated according to the various rites of the Oriental Church. In a former paper we gave a brief sketch of the four great Liturgies of the West, the *Roman*, the *Ambrosian*, the *Gallican*, and the *Mozarabic*. We shall now briefly review the four principal Liturgies of the Eastern Church, namely, the *Greek*, the *Armenian*, the *Syriac*, and the *Coptic*. These Liturgies, unlike those of the West, are classed according to the languages used in their celebration. Before we proceed with our task, it seems proper to say something of them with respect to their authorship.

ST. JAMES'.

Among the Liturgies in use in the Eastern Church that of St. James the Less, Bishop of Jerusalem, is the most ancient. Most of the Fathers, ecclesiastical writers, and liturgists are of opinion, that the Apostles did not celebrate Mass before they had received the plenitude of divine grace on Pentecost. St. Chrysostom seems to allude to this in one of his sermons on Pentecost, in which he says, that the Holy Spirit brought us the assurance of our reconciliation with God, after which *feasts* and *gifts* are in order.[1] The Ven. Bede speaks more clearly on this point, when, in one of his homilies on Pentecost, he assures us, that as soon as the Apostles received the Divine Spirit, they offered the Holy Sacrifice.[2] Moreover, St. Thomas, giving the reason why the Church selected the season immediately after Pentecost for the solemnity of Corpus Christi, says it is because during that time the faithful began to frequent this sacrament.[3] We may add also as a theological reason, that, as the Old Law was not abrogated before Pentecost, it is not likely that the sacrifice of the New Law was offered before that day.

The Apostles received the Holy Ghost in the *cœnaculum* at Jerusalem, and it is probable that there the Holy Sacrifice was offered the first time. It is generally admitted that St. Peter, who had been constituted the prince of the Apostles, was the celebrant. Shortly after Pentecost St. James was appointed Bishop of Jerusalem, and we cannot imagine that he allowed much time to pass before instituting a form and prescribing the manner in which the august mysteries were to be celebrated. Although many liturgists hold that no

[1] Hodierno die Sanctus Spiritus ad naturam nostram descendit. . . . Cum enim uniti sunt et reconciliati inter se inimici sequuntur invitationes, convivia et munera. —*Opera omnia*, Montfaucon, Paris, 1718, Tom. II., p. 461.

[2] Novum in ea sacrificium Domino ipsi quoque Apostoli mox accepto dono Spiritus obtulerunt. *Opera*, Basileæ, 1563, Tom. VII., col. 59.

[3] Nam et in eodem tempore cœpit hoc Sacramentum a fidelibus frequentari.—*Officium Corp. Christi*, Lect. V., *Opera omnia*, Parmæ, 1864.

liturgy was committed to writing in the first centuries, but that they were transmitted orally, yet almost all agree that the principal ones of the East may be traced to those whose names they bear. We must not, however, conclude from this, that they passed from their hands as we find them at present. Many prayers and formularies were added to them, which were necessary in later ages to bear witness to the faith against heretics, when these did the same to profess and propagate their errors. Hence Cardinal Bellarmine, speaking of this Liturgy, says, that in course of time so many additions were made to it, that it is impossible to ascertain what part of it may be attributed to this Apostle.[1]

Constant and perpetual tradition attests the authenticity of this Liturgy. Not only the Greeks and the other Oriental Churches, orthodox, schismatical, or heretical, but the Western Church also, hold that St. James prescribed a Liturgy for his Church, and assert that from this all the other Oriental Liturgies take their origin. It is impossible that all these Churches, so unlike in their customs, so dissimilar in their habits, and so distinct from one another, should agree on this point, if there was not some foundation for it. We have, however, the authority of ancient writers also to confirm us in our opinion. St. Epiphanius, in his 79th Heresy, after enumerating the Apostles, subjoins that they were the composers of a Liturgy, together with St. James.[2] St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his fifth Catechetical Instruction, explains to the newly-baptized the principal parts of the Liturgy in use at his time. Beginning with the Oblation, he continues it to the end. These explanations coincide with the order found in the Liturgy usually attributed to St. James. In the seventh century we find the Council *in Trullo* referring to the

[1] Liturgia S. Jacobo attributa a posterioribus ita locupletata est, ut non sit facile dijudicare quæ pars S. Jacobum habeat auctorem.—*De Script. Eccles.*, *v. Jacobus*; Neapoli, 1872.

[2] Et mysteriorum ordinatores fuere cum Jacobo, fratre Domini, primo Hierosol. Episcopo.—*Patr. Græc.*, Migne, Paris, 1863. col. 743.

Liturgies of St. James and St. Basil to refute the Armenians, who used wine only in the Holy Sacrifice. And Leo Allatius,[1] in his defence of this Liturgy, produces a long array of testimonies, which fully demonstrate that it is the genuine work of St. James.

Protestants deny its authenticity, because we find in it the *Trisagion* or *Doxology* and the words *Homousion* and *Theotocos*, terms, as they allege, not in use before the Council of Chalcedon. But they are mistaken, as these terms are used and applied in the same meaning by many Fathers before that date.[2] But granted that they were not, it is folly on their part on this account to call into question its genuineness. We may as well deny that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, because mention is made in it of his death and burial, or the authenticity of the Psalms, because they contain many things that can in no way be attributed to David. This Liturgy was originally celebrated in Syro-Chaldæic, and written in Greek probably by St. James for the Greek proselytes in Jerusalem and the other parts of the East. From his Greek composition all the Syriac Liturgies of to-day were translated.

ST. BASIL'S.

The Liturgy of St. James was in use down to the time of St. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea, A. D. 370. That this holy bishop composed a Liturgy is beyond all doubt. St. Gregory Nazianzen tells us, that he prescribed a formula of prayers to be used at the altar, and St. Basil himself[3] describes this formula, which was used in all his monasteries. Peter the

[1] *Epist. ad Bartoldum Niliusium.*

[2] The Trisagion is found in Isaias, ch. vi., and Apocalypse, ch. iv., 8.—Athanasius, *De Synodis, Patr. Græc.*, Paris, 1857, and Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.*, Lib. I., c. 13, *Paris*, 1673, tell us, that the term *Homousion* was long in use before the Council of Nice; and Evagrius, Lib. I., *Hist.*, c. 2, Paris, 1673, assures us, that the B. V. Mary was called *Theotocos* or *Deipara* by many of the Fathers before the Council of Ephesus.

[3] *Ep.* 63 *ad Clerum Neo-Cæsariensem*, *Patr. Græc.*, Migne, Paris, 1886.

Deacon, at the close of the sixth century, who wrote a treatise on Grace, to prove its necessity, adduces from the Liturgy a prayer which, he says, is in use throughout the East.[1]

The origin of this Liturgy is ascribed by St. Proclus and Amphilochius[2] to different causes. St. Proclus tells us, that on account of the tedious length of St. James' Liturgy, to which both the people and clergy were opposed, St. Basil found it necessary to make a compendium of it. Amphilochius, on the other hand, asserts, that St. Basil begged Christ to allow him to celebrate the divine mysteries in his own words. Christ appeared to him in prayer and gave him a commission to write a new Liturgy. This narration, however, must not be taken literally. It merely implies, according to Renaudot, that before he began his work, St. Basil invoked the aid of God, and with the divine assistance performed the task.

Several codices of this Liturgy are extant, but it is impossible to determine precisely what part may be attributed to him. Some prayers have been added, which are manifestly of a later date. These additions, however, are few and of little moment. It is worthy of note, that it does not contain the full order or rubrics of the Mass. These were taken from the common Liturgy in use at that time. According to St. Proclus, he composed two forms of the Liturgy, one shorter than the other, the latter to consult his own wishes, the former to satisfy the desires of the clergy and people. Of this Liturgy there are three copies, which, though they differ in many ways, are the same in substance. The *first* begins *Domine Deus Noster*, and was translated into Latin from the Greek. The *second*, beginning with the words *Æterne Deus*, was translated from the Syriac. It is probably the most authentic, as it is supposed to have been translated

[1] "Quam pene universus frequentat Oriens."—*De Incarn. et Gratia*, c. 8, *Pat. Lat.*, Migne, 1863.

[2] The life of St. Basil, though published under the name of Amphilochius, is denied by all critics to be his work.

from the Greek by St. Ephrem, whom St. Basil ordained Deacon. The *third* begins *Domine qui nosti*, and was translated by the Maronite Victor Scialach from an Egyptian codex, to which was attached an Arabic translation.[1] This Liturgy was originally composed in Greek, and translated into other languages when it began to be used in the various Oriental Churches.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S.

During the greater part of the year the Greeks use a Liturgy which is commonly known as that of St. Chrysostom. It was first attributed to him by the Council *in Trullo*, about 300 years after his death. St. Proclus, Abbot Nilus, and Palladius, his biographer, assure us that he composed a Liturgy. Having noticed, they say, the disgust shown by the people for the Liturgy of St. Basil, on account of its prolixity, he determined to introduce a shorter one. Just as St. Basil's was a compendium of St. James', so this may be considered a synopsis of St. Basil's. At least he inserted many formularies found in the latter. Authors of more recent date show their unqualified adherence to this opinion. Mark of Esphesus, Jeremias, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Card. Bessarion attest, that their Churches received from their predecessors two Liturgies, the longer one being that of St. Basil, and a more compendious one by St. Chrysostom.[2] This Liturgy is used by the followers of Nestorius, who was condemned in the Council of Ephesus.

[1] The first may be found in the *Edit. Joan. Gillotii Trecensis*, Antverpiæ, 1570. The second and third in *Renaudot, Orient. Lit. Collectio.* Parisiis, 1716.

[2] Nos sequentes et ii, qui postea missam ipsam concisiorem ediderunt, tum magnus ille Basilius, tum post Joannes Chrysostomus. Marcus Ephesinus, *Lib. de Exposit. Missæ.*

Quod Liturgia S. Basilii superat et plenior est verbis, divus autem Chrysostomus compendiosius et concisius loquitur.—Jeremias, *cap.* 13, *Censuræ Orientalis Ecclesiæ.*

Hinc est quod Basilius Jacobi, Chrysostomus vero Basilii missas breviores fecerunt. Bessarion, *Lib. de Euchar.*, apud Bona, *Rer. Lit.* Lib. I., c. ix., § 3.

A. D. 431. It was well known in Constantinople at that time, and consequently we may conjecture that he composed it between A. D. 397 and 404, in which year he was expelled from his see the second time. In course of time many additions were made to it, so that, as is the case with the two preceding Liturgies, it is impossible to determine which of the numerous and divers copies or parts of them may be attributed to this Saint. It was originally written in Greek.

ST. MARK'S.

It is beyond doubt that St. Mark was appointed Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt by St. Peter. It is not surprising, therefore, that its Christian inhabitants believe that he prescribed a Liturgy. Among many others, Card. Bona and his annotator Sala deny its authenticity. The reasons they allege are: 1. that ancient authors make no mention of it, and 2. that it contains many things which cannot be reconciled with the age of this Evangelist. These reasons, however, do not appear to be valid, as the same objections may be made to other Liturgies, whose genuineness they do not call into question. If he did not compose a *new* Liturgy, we may at least suppose that he introduced into his Church the Liturgy in use at Jerusalem in his time, which he altered and to which he made many additions, conformable to the habits and customs of the people to whom he was sent. This composition, out of reverence to him, the Christians called by his name. Moreover, the Jacobites, strictly Eutychians, *Copts* as they are called, have always used this Liturgy. They are separated from the Church since the Council of Chalcedon. It is not likely that, after their separation, they would have accepted from her this Liturgy, unless the tradition that St. Mark was its author had been well founded.

A codex of this Liturgy attributed to St. Mark, found at Rossano, in Calabria, seems to confirm this opinion. Ac-

from the Greek by St. Ephrem, whom St. Basil ordained Deacon. The *third* begins *Domine qui nosti*, and was translated by the Maronite Victor Scialach from an Egyptian codex, to which was attached an Arabic translation.[1] This Liturgy was originally composed in Greek, and translated into other languages when it began to be used in the various Oriental Churches.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM'S.

During the greater part of the year the Greeks use a Liturgy which is commonly known as that of St. Chrysostom. It was first attributed to him by the Council *in Trullo*, about 300 years after his death. St. Proclus, Abbot Nilus, and Palladius, his biographer, assure us that he composed a Liturgy. Having noticed, they say, the disgust shown by the people for the Liturgy of St. Basil, on account of its prolixity, he determined to introduce a shorter one. Just as St. Basil's was a compendium of St. James', so this may be considered a synopsis of St. Basil's. At least he inserted many formularies found in the latter. Authors of more recent date show their unqualified adherence to this opinion. Mark of Esphesus, Jeremias, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Card. Bessarion attest, that their Churches received from their predecessors two Liturgies, the longer one being that of St. Basil, and a more compendious one by St. Chrysostom.[2] This Liturgy is used by the followers of Nestorius, who was condemned in the Council of Ephesus.

[1] The first may be found in the *Edit. Joan. Gillotii Trecensis*, Antverpiæ, 1570. The second and third in *Renaudot, Orient. Lit. Collectio.* Parisiis, 1716.

[2] Nos sequentes et ii, qui postea missam ipsam concisiorem ediderunt, tum magnus ille Basilius, tum post Joannes Chrysostomus. Marcus Ephesinus, *Lib. de Exposit. Missæ.*

Quod Liturgia S. Basilii superat et plenior est verbis, divus autem Chrysostomus compendiosius et concisius loquitur.—Jeremias, *cap.* 13, *Censuræ Orientalis Ecclesiæ.*

Hinc est quod Basilius Jacobi, Chrysostomus vero Basilii missas breviores fecerunt. Bessarion, *Lib. de Euchar.*, apud Bona, *Rer. Lit.* Lib. I., c. ix., § 3.

A. D. 431. It was well known in Constantinople at that time, and consequently we may conjecture that he composed it between A. D. 397 and 404, in which year he was expelled from his see the second time. In course of time many additions were made to it, so that, as is the case with the two preceding Liturgies, it is impossible to determine which of the numerous and divers copies or parts of them may be attributed to this Saint. It was originally written in Greek.

ST. MARK'S.

It is beyond doubt that St. Mark was appointed Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt by St. Peter. It is not surprising, therefore, that its Christian inhabitants believe that he prescribed a Liturgy. Among many others, Card. Bona and his annotator Sala deny its authenticity. The reasons they allege are: 1. that ancient authors make no mention of it, and 2. that it contains many things which cannot be reconciled with the age of this Evangelist. These reasons, however, do not appear to be valid, as the same objections may be made to other Liturgies, whose genuineness they do not call into question. If he did not compose a *new* Liturgy, we may at least suppose that he introduced into his Church the Liturgy in use at Jerusalem in his time, which he altered and to which he made many additions, conformable to the habits and customs of the people to whom he was sent. This composition, out of reverence to him, the Christians called by his name. Moreover, the Jacobites, strictly Eutychians, *Copts* as they are called, have always used this Liturgy. They are separated from the Church since the Council of Chalcedon. It is not likely that, after their separation, they would have accepted from her this Liturgy, unless the tradition that St. Mark was its author had been well founded.

A codex of this Liturgy attributed to St. Mark, found at Rossano, in Calabria, seems to confirm this opinion. Ac-

cording to Card. Perroni it contains a rite similar to that used anciently in Jerusalem and Alexandria, and if compared with the Liturgies used by the Copts, it becomes apparent that it was the original, from which all others were formed. The order, disposition of ceremonies, and the prayers, if we except a diversity in the use of terms, are the same. This copy is written in Greek, the liturgical language in Egypt before A. D. 450, and belongs at the latest to the eleventh century. The Copts after their separation used the Coptic language exclusively, and in consequence after a few centuries Greek was almost unknown among them. It is impossible, therefore, that it should have been composed by them. In all probability it is a copy of the Liturgy employed in the Church of Alexandria down to the fifth century. In that century St. Cyril, who succeeded Dioscorus, composed another for that Church, which, like the above-mentioned, was written in Greek. This Liturgy bears so great a resemblance to that of St. Mark, that they may be said to be one and the same Liturgy. In fact, the Egyptians called it indiscriminately by the names of St. Mark and St. Cyril.

OF THE PRESANCTIFIED.

Besides these Liturgies there are many others in use. Some are of doubtful origin, others are productions of those whose names they bear. Some are common to all; others are peculiar to individual Oriental Churches. Abraham Ecchellensis says that the Syrians had more than fifty, of which he enumerates thirty one.[1] We shall not delay in treating them. We cannot, however, pass over a Liturgy which is used exclusively during Lent by the Greeks, that of the *Presanctified*.

It cannot be called a Mass, for no consecration takes place, but one of the particles, which were consecrated on some preceding day, is consumed. It is generally celebrated during the afternoon. In its nature it resembles the ser-

[1] Abraham Ecchellensis, in *Notis ad Catalogum Hebediesu*.

vices of Good Friday morning in the Western Church. The celebrant on Sunday consecrates as many particles as he wishes or is obliged to say Masses during the week, Saturday excepted. Having consecrated these, he dips them into the Precious Blood [1] and places them in a pix or ciborium. At the evening services on the following days he consumes one of these. The Greeks believe that it was instituted by the Apostles or their immediate successors, and attribute it to the same origin as the fast of Lent.[2] The Council of Laodicea seems to refer to this Liturgy when, in the 49th Canon, the Fathers profess, that during Lent the Eucharistic Bread should be offered on Saturday and Sunday only.[3] Hence those who refer its institution to Gregory I or II, or to St. Germane of Constantinople, are manifestly in error.

In all the essential parts of the sacrifice the Eastern Liturgies agree with those of the Western Church. Hence in all we find the Oblation, Consecration, and Communion. Their difference consists in the disposition of parts, the prayers and ceremonies, which may be called accidental. These were selected to suit the genius of the people. The Eastern Liturgies are longer than those of the West. In the former there are two principal divisions, the first extending to the *kiss of peace*, which is always given before the Consecration in the East, and the second from that point to the end. The first part is the same in almost all the Liturgies of any given Church. It is for this reason, that many codices begin abruptly from the kiss of peace, which on that account seemed to some incomplete. The second part, called *Ana-*

[1] In some of the Oriental Churches, especially in Constantinople, this ceremony is not observed.

[2] Præsanct. Missa ab antiquo tempore et ex Apostolorum successoribus originem habet. Credimus eam ab initio propter jejunium institutam.—*Simeon Thessalonicensis ad Gabrielem Pentapolitanum.*

[3] Quod non oportet in Quadragesima panem offerre nisi Sabbato et Dominica die. —Apud Bona, *Rer. Lit.* Lib. I., C. xv., § 5.

phora, which corresponds to the Canon in the Latin rite, unlike that in the Western Church, varies for every feast.

These are the principal Liturgies of the East and will suffice the purpose of this article. We shall now proceed to treat these Liturgies according to their denomination with respect to the language used.

GREEK.

Down to the fourth century the Greek language was used in all the oriental churches, except probably in Syria, where the vernacular was also employed. This language was then spoken throughout Asia, Greece, Egypt, and the provinces of Macedonia. It is for this reason that ancient writers understood by the *Greek* Church all the churches of the East. At present the Greek Church includes only those who use this language in their Liturgy, or who were originally converted to the true faith by the Greeks, as the Russians, Poles, Mingrelians, Georgians, etc., and the *Melchite* Greeks.[1]

This Liturgy is celebrated in Greek in the kingdom of Greece and in the schismatic Churches of the Ottoman Empire subject to the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, and by the Catholic Greeks of Constantinople and those inhabiting many cities of Italy, especially in Calabria, and in the Islands of Sicily and Corsica. The same rite is used in Sarmatia, Servia, Bosnia, Bulgaria,[2] and the provinces near

[1] After the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, in which Eutyches and Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, were condemned, a schism arose in Antioch and Alexandria between the Catholics and those who did not adhere to this Council. In Syria and other parts of the East the followers of Eutyches were called *Jacobites*, from James Zanzalus or Baradæus, one of their reformers, and in Africa *Monophysites*, because they held that there was but one nature, one will, and one operation in Christ. The Catholics were styled *Melchites*, from the Syriac *Malko* or *Meleck* (king or emperor), because they complied with the edict of the Emperor Marcian, to abide by the decisions of this Council.

[2] The Bulgarians living in Constantinople and its suburbs are under the jurisdiction of an Archbishop. Those in Thrace and Macedonia are subjects of two Vicars-Apostolic.

the Black Sea in the Illyrian or Slavonic language; by the inhabitants of Mingrelia and Georgia in their own tongue; by the Uniat and schismatical Churches of Poland, Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Galicia, in the province of Lemberg, in the Ruthenian language; by the Melchite Greeks in the Patriarchate of Antioch[1] in Arabic; and in Transylvania and Walachia in the Walachian tongue.[2]

All these make use of the Liturgy of St. Basil on the vigils of Christmas and Epiphany, the feast of St. Basil,[3] and all the Sundays of Lent, except Palm Sunday, Maundy-Thursday, and Holy Saturday. The Liturgy of the Presanctified is employed on all the days of Lent, except Saturday and Sunday, and on the feast of the Annunciation. On all the other days of the year that of St. Chrysostom is observed.

The Greek rite employed by the Greeks in Italy has been changed in some particulars. For the education of students destined for the Greek rite in Italy Gregory XIII opened a college in 1566, and in 1596 Clement VIII ordained that a Greek prelate should be resident in Rome for the ordination of these students and the performance of the ceremonies according to this rite.

ARMENIAN.

The Armenians were converted to Christianity by St. Bartholomew, and after him their greatest Apostle was St. Gregory the *Illuminator*. He was educated at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and consecrated bishop by St. Leontius, the predecessor of St. Basil. For a long time it was the duty of the Bishop of Cæsarea to consecrate the primate of Armenia, and St. Basil for a while had this Church under his jurisdiction. From this close connection and intercourse we may

[1] This Patriarch is titled of Antioch, of the Melchites, who resides at Damascus.

[2] In Istria, Liburnia, and maritime Dalmatia the Latin rite is used in the Illyrian or Slavonic language.

[3] Jan. 1.

safely infer that they made use of the same rite, which becomes evident by comparing their Liturgies. In substance the Armenian rite is taken from the Liturgy of St. Chysostom, whom, together with SS. Athanasius and Basil, they regard as the author of their Liturgy. Towards the end of the fourth century, or the beginning of the fifth, the Sacred Scriptures were translated into their language, and it is probable that about the same time they began to celebrate the Divine Mysteries in Armenian, although they retain even at present many Greek words. Towards the end of the fifth century they became infected with the Greek heresies, and separated from the Church, very few remaining faithful and accepting the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon. They returned several times to the bosom of the true Church, but as often retraced their steps to their former errors.[1]

Though in substance the Armenian Liturgy is like that of St. Chrysostom, yet its composition is different. They use one and the same Liturgy throughout the year, which, according to the best critics, is the work of John, Patriarch of the Armenians in the fifth century. It was translated into Italian by Gabriel Avedichian, from which we have a French translation[2] by J. B. E. Pascal.

The Catholic Armenians have an established hierarchy subject to the Patriarch of Cilicia, entitled "Of the Armenians," who resides at Constantinople. To him all Armenians, except a few in the Russian Empire, are subject.[3]

A prelate resides in Rome for ordaining priests of this rite. During the present pontificate a college was opened

[1] During the Pontificate of John XXII B. Bartholomew of Bologna was created bishop of Naxivan, and sent to that city in greater Armenia. After three years of indefatigable labor he induced many to make use of the Latin rite, though they retained the Armenian language in their services. During the war between the Russians and the Turks, 1757, these Christians fled with their archbishop to Smyrna in Anatolia, where they still exist. They number about 1000.

[2] Migne, *Encyclopédie Théologique*, Tome viii.

[3] Down to the pontificate of Pius IX the Armenians living in Constantinople were subjects of the Vicar Patriarch.

in Rome for Armenian students. They are spread throughout Turkey in Asia, and have bishops in Lemberg (Galicia), Artuin (Russia), and Alexandria (Egypt).

SYRIAC.

In the churches of Antioch and Jerusalem, the Syriac language was used with the Greek from the time of the Apostles. Hence the denomination, *Syriac* rite. The difference in language was probably the only one between this and the other Oriental rites before the Council of Chalcedon, when the Monophysite heresy began to spread. In course of time various modifications were made, and two other rites, the *Syro-Maronite* and the *Syro-Chaldaic*, were formed. Hence at present the Syriac Church is divided into three classes. The *pure* Syriac rite is employed in Syria proper, and all the Catholic Syrians are subject to the Patriarch of Antioch styled "of the Syrians," who resides at Mardin. This patriarchate consists of four archbishops and seven bishops. Both the Catholic and schismatic Syrians use the Liturgy of St. James, at least on his feast, and during the year that of St. Basil, translated into the Syriac. Besides these they have many others, which are used on the feasts of those saints whose names they bear.[1]

Syro-Maronite. This rite is evidently derived from the pure Syriac. Though it contains many liturgical prayers and ceremonies not found in the latter, yet its conformity to it is very striking. On account of the constant communication between the Maronites and the Roman Church, and their close adherence to the Apostolic See, many things were introduced from the latter.[2] Many writers refer their origin to Maro, a Monothelite of the seventh century, who afterwards abjured his errors and was reconciled to the Church, but

[1] Liturgies of St. John, St. Peter, twelve Apostles, St. Sixtus, St. Julius, St. Dionysius, etc.

[2] They use unleavened bread; their vestments are like those used in the Roman rite; they allow several Low Masses to be celebrated the same day on the same altar, etc.

the more probable opinion obtains, that it originated with the holy Abbot Maro, in the fourth century. This seems to be the tradition among the Maronites, and is confirmed by Benedict XIV.[1] The Maronites are confined to Mt. Libanus and the surrounding country, though some are found in Cyprus and Egypt. They are subject to the Patriarch of Antioch, entitled "Of the Maronites," who resides at Becherche-Diman, near Mt. Libanus. His subjects number about 150,000, and his clergy about 1500. They employ the Liturgy of St. James on his festival, and on other days that of St. Basil, translated into Syriac. They have many other Liturgies in use on the feasts of the saints to whom they are ascribed, or in whose honor they were composed. They have a college in Rome.

Syro-Chaldaic. This division of the Syriac Church is the largest. The partisans of Nestorius, condemned in the Council of Ephesus, and of Eutyches, were numerous. They spread their errors throughout Chaldea, Syria, Persia, India, and even in China. Down to the sixteenth century these with few exceptions adhered to Nestorianism. In the following century overtures were made for a return to Catholic unity, and the patriarchate of Babylon was re-established at Mossul, where the Babylonian Patriarch styled "Of the Chaldeans" resides. To him the Catholics of this rite in Chaldea, Syria, and Persia are subject. Those living on the Malabar coast are under the jurisdiction of two vicars-apostolic of the Latin rite, resident at Trichoor and Cottayam.

The Nestorians still abound in those regions. They employ three Liturgies, 1. of the Apostles, 2. of Theodore of Mopsuesta, and 3. of Nestorius. Renaudot, who translated them, observes that the first is the Liturgy used by the Syrians before the time of Nestorius, and is the universal canon from which the other two were formed. The Catholics use those of St. James and St. Basil. In all these Liturgies, even in India and China, the Syriac language is used.

[1] *Allocutio habita die* 13 Julii 1744.

COPTIC.

There exists a great similarity between the Liturgies of the East and that of the Church of Alexandria, to which the Copts and Abyssinians belong. Down to the fifth century the language used in this Church was the Greek. A large portion of the people not being acquainted with this language, it is probable that in that century the use of the vernacular, called Coptic, began. Dioscorus, the successor of St. Cyril, adhered to Eutyches and drew into this schism most of the native Egyptians. Whilst these celebrated in the Coptic, those who remained faithful to the Church continued the use of Greek. In 660, the Mohametans made themselves masters of Egypt, and the Catholics were crushed, whilst the schismatics were allowed the free exercise of their religion. The Abyssinians were Christianized by the Patriarchs of Alexandria, and most of them still persevere in their schism.

Both the Catholics and heretics made use of the Liturgy employed down to the fifth century, which is commonly attributed to St. Mark, but is entitled that of St. Cyril. They have also, among many others, those of St. Basil and St. Gregory Nazianzen. These Liturgies, as in use among the schismatics, contain nothing contrary to Catholic doctrine, though in the last two mentioned they insert before the Communion a profession of the errors of Eutyches.

The schismatical Copts and Abyssinians are governed by their patriarch, who is styled the Patriarch of Alexandria "Of the Copts." He resides at Cairo. The Catholic Copts have no established hierarchy. They are subject to a vicar-apostolic, who resides at Cairo. The Abyssinians who use the *Gheez* dialect in their Liturgy are under the jurisdiction of a vicar-apostolic residing at Keren.

All the Liturgies used in the Oriental Church, whether by the Copts, Syrians, Armenians, or Greeks, whether by Catholics, schismatics, or heretics, are perfectly uniform, not on-

ly in what belongs to the essence of the sacrifice, but also in the order maintained in their services. They have their altars, sacred vessels, and vestments for their ministers. The holy sacrifice is introduced by prayers, the singing of psalms, the reading of lessons from the Old and New Testaments, and supplications for all stations in life. Then follow the kiss of peace, the oblation, the preface, the consecration, prayers for the living and the dead, the breaking of the host, the Lord's Prayer, the profession of faith in the Real Presence, the adoration, and the Communion of both clergy and laity. Though the majority has been separated from the Catholic Church over fourteen hundred years, yet they have never introduced into their Liturgies anything inconsistent with Catholic doctrine. The differences existing between them are merely accidental, affecting in no manner the essence of the adorable sacrifice. Of these differences, as well as of those between the Eastern and Western Churches, we shall treat in a subsequent article.

S. L. E.

ON THE EVE OF CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

WHEN persons present themselves to the parish priest, announcing their intention of contracting marriage, they are to be questioned regarding certain facts intimately connected with their own future happiness and with the general good of the community, religious and civil, of which they are or will be members. The Church makes the priest partly responsible for the results, good or evil, which follow from the union which he witnesses and blesses in her name. But she also gives him, in her ecclesiastical canons and the rules and precautions laid down in her Ritual, safe means of conduct, by which he may correct and supply errors or deficiencies in the lives of those who come to him

for a solemn ratification of their marriage-union. The obligation of having the Banns of marriage publicly announced, some weeks before it is blessed, affords the pastor a valuable opportunity to set right whatever may need rectifying, and also to dispose the parties intending marriage so as to realize the importance of this step into a new life full of serious responsibilities, although not without its doubled consolations and joys if entered under the benediction of God.

Before we may bless the nuptials, we are to ascertain, first: Are there any canonical impediments which would forbid the marriage altogether or render it invalid if contracted without proper dispensation? Secondly: Are the parties really Catholics or are they so merely nominally, without a sufficient knowledge of the faith which they profess? Thirdly: Do they understand the grave obligations which they contract in becoming husband and wife or parents? Lastly: Are their souls properly disposed for the reception of the sacramental grace which is inseparably bound up with the character of marriage in the Church?

I.

Every student of theology is familiar with the two classes of impediments which render matrimony either illicit or invalid, according to their character. Some of them do not affect us in the United States, owing to the changed conditions of society since their institution, or the non-promulgation among us of certain ecclesiastical laws. Ordinarily we are to make sure that the parties presenting themselves are both professedly Catholics; that they are of age; that they are free, which means, that neither party is bound in marriage or solemn promise of marriage to any one else; that there exists between them no relationship within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity or affinity, nor any spiritual relation. As there are among canonical impediments some which should properly remain a secret from others, or which neither party would be willing to reveal be-

fore the other (as for example "affinitas ex cop. illicita, etc.), inquiry into such, since they may invalidate a marriage, must be made separately, perhaps some time later, in the tribunal of penance, where a person could unburden himself without false shame or fear and receive the necessary direction. It is not our purpose to speak here of marriage between persons one of whom is not Catholic, since, being forbidden and not to be blessed in the church, they require a special method of treatment by the Catholic priest, when, in order to avoid greater evils, it becomes his duty to witness them.

II.

Persons who have been baptized and call themselves Catholics may have the grace of faith, or, by reason of their associations, possess a sincere attachment to the Church and the disposition of accepting all the truths and moral obligations implied in the confession: I believe in the Catholic Church. Yet they may not be able to formulate in a way clear to themselves, much less to give an intelligent account to others, of the faith that is in them. Like invincible or inculpable ignorance, it may save their souls, but it will not save the souls of their children, who during the years when their hearts and minds are most impressionable, and long afterwards, depend for the knowledge of the rudiments of faith on their parents. When persons enter the marriage state, they at once assume the profession of teacher to the children with whom God may bless their union, and they are under the holiest obligation to be rightly and at least sufficiently equipped for this position, which involves the happiness temporal or eternal of their progeny and frequently of subsequent generations. This is the reason why the Ritual exacts that the pastor examine those who intend to be married, as to their knowledge of the Catholic doctrine, "cum ea deinde filios suos docere debeant," a caution which might otherwise seem superfluous. The late Plenary Coun-

cil of Baltimore, following out the injunction of the Ritual, says: "Fidelium matrimoniis præmitti etiam deberet opportunum examen quo contrahentes de religione examinentur et instruantur.[1] It speaks of the faithful (fidelis), not simply of neophytes or of persons who are willing to embrace the Catholic religion before marriage.

The manner of this examination must, of course, be suited to the age, intellectual capacity, and social conditions of the applicants. It need not be done in form of catechetical questioning, but rather in the way of a friendly conversation on the subject of religion. Starting from the idea of matrimony as a sacred institution, we can easily revert to the sacrament of baptism, with the obligations we assumed, through our sponsors, of fidelity to the doctrines of Christ and His Church. Thus an easy and natural survey may be made of the fundamental doctrines, and from the answers we draw forth we may readily form an idea of the knowledge and ability to impart that knowledge to others, which the persons before us possess. If we find that there is a lack in this respect, it will be necessary to ask them to repeat their visits, or to put them otherwise in the way of certain and definite knowledge. All this may require tact and indulgence and the exercise of other virtues on the part of a pastor, but it has the advantage also, besides making them better Catholics, of allowing him to study and know the people who, as a family, will in most cases form a permanent and by their influence perhaps an important part of his future pastoral care.

III.

When we know those who apply to us in order to be married, and are assured of their being well grounded in the Catholic faith and able to instruct others at least in the rudiments, then this instruction is, of course, unnecessary. But there is a chapter in Christian doctrine which we can-

[1] Conc. Plen. Balt. III., n. 135.—Cf. Rituale Rom., Tit. vii. Cap. i., n. 1.

not pass over. It regards the special obligations of the new state of life which they are about to enter. For obvious reasons writers on pastoral theology suggest that this instruction should invariably be given by a priest well advanced in years, and whose very exterior stamps his words with a fatherly character. It certainly requires, besides prudence and great delicacy, not only gravity of demeanor but careful preparation in the priest, whoever he be. The scope of this instruction embraces the following points:

This union of husband and wife is a bond which cannot be broken except by death. To take a step of such lasting consequence rashly and thoughtlessly, would be folly, bringing upon them the irreparable sorrow of a lifetime. Let them therefore weigh whether the conditions of their age, their education, their temperaments, habits of life, and tastes are such as to render a lifelong companionship, for better for worse, in sickness as in health, in old age as now —a life which their mutual love would make a happy one for them under all circumstances. Neither passion nor any purely temporal advantage could ever compensate for the absence of these qualities for forming a permanent bond, the secret of whose strength is love, which divides sorrow and joy by a mutual participation. If they have any doubt on this point, let them speak openly their minds and allow the judgment as to what is best for them, to another, who is swayed by the sole wish of their real and permanent welfare.

But marriage has been instituted to bring unto man the blessings of children. Let husband and wife look upon each other as instruments in the hand of God, bound to fulfil a higher purpose than the satisfaction of sensible love. It is perhaps premature to speak to young persons, and who cannot as yet fully realize the importance of their future duty as parents, upon the obligations they owe to their children. Hence instructions given to Christian fathers and mothers upon education aptly form a separate function of the parochial duty. But we may and should warn in becoming

words against all reckless excessess and misuse of their marriage rights, which, apart from being sinful, are invariably avenged by the most lamentable results to mothers and their infants. Let them take counsel with a prudent and conscientious physician, if they deem it necessary, even from the beginning of their married state, when he may give them advice without which it is possible that they destroy forever their domestic happiness.

All this will be secured or facilitated if they are induced to adopt certain measures which, like rules of life, contribute to make their future common home happy. Among these things must be reckoned, that the husband have a steady occupation, and that he be willing to forego certain advantages of income and position rather than be even temporarily idle, unless necessity compel him to it. He should be the guardian of his home, and seek neither his recreation elsewhere, nor debar his wife from any enjoyment which she may partake with him. His earnings should be a common advantage, and his friendships an honor to his name as husband.—The wife, on the other hand, is to exert herself to make home thoroughly pleasant to her consort. Attention and punctuality in supplying him with those daily comforts which assure him of her affection and ward off the feeling of discontent; neatness and cleanliness and order in her domestic arrangements; a pleasant face and a quiet forbearance when toil and disappointment have ruffled his temper and put him out of sorts with the world outside; these things make for happiness in the truest sense of the word. They must trust each other, have no secrets between them, and banish beforehand the demon of jealousy. They may expect to see faults in each other as time goes on, but they will find it to their common advantage to bear them, to carry one another's burden, and readily to forgive. Unbroken fidelity to each other under all circumstances is the guarantee of their happiness. A Christian couple can render such dispositions natural in their daily lives if they be

careful to observe the precepts of their holy faith. Teach them fidelity to their monthly confession, their Sunday and holyday attendance at church, their common domestic devotions. Let a husband know how to say grace aloud at his table and to observe the practice within the hearing of all those who may seat themselves at his board. If he kneels down morning and night at his prayers, and gathers, if possible, the rest of his family around him to do the same, there will be peace and joy in that home, and it will preach a more effective sermon by example to young and old, than the best missionary could do on all the days of the year. As soon as they are aware that God has blessed their marriage, the husband will remember that he is bound to honor with an especial honor the wife who bears him the pledge of their love. He must treat her with the utmost care, save her all hardship and excitement which might prejudice the health and safety of herself or her child. She herself, on the other hand, owes it to God, to her husband, and the infant which she bears, to avoid all exciting amusement or intemperate indulgence. The prayer of father and mother should all along accompany the life of this precious gift of God from its first beginning. When her time approaches, let the mother prepare for it by the devout reception of the sacraments. It may be the last time for her. The nearness of the divine Infant in her heart to the child she expects will sanctify the latter even before it is born. St. Charles Borromeo, instructing his priests on the subject, adds: "Cum uxor est gravida, frequentius ambo in oratione precibusque versentur, quibus a Deo prolem optimam impetrent."[1] And when the day of her sorrow has ended in the joy of the new-born infant, let them offer it at once to God and lose no time in having it baptized. This is an important fact. The delay of baptism, whether through unreasonable tenderness or thoughtlessness, often exerts an evil influence for life upon the child. But the pastor will have occasion

[1] Act. Mediol. IV., p. 459.

to speak of this at the proper time, if his people have learned to look upon him as the guide of their souls from the beginning of their married life.

IV.

There remains but one thing after we have satisfied ourselves that the object, the sanctity, and the solemn duties of the marriage state are understood and appreciated. This is to prepare the candidates for the devout reception of the Sacrament of Matrimony, by eliciting those pious dispositions which place them in the state of grace, and assure their worthy approach to the altar of God. They realize the responsibilities of the new life which they are about to enter, and they must feel that they need the help and blessing of God. This sacrament, great in the Church " as St. Paul declares, perfects natural love by grace, strengthens the bond of a mutual attachment, and sanctifies those who contract it. Such is the language of the Council of Trent. The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore has the following: We admonish pastors of souls that, mindful of their office, they use all solicitude in rightly preparing the faithful who approach to receive the Sacrament of Matrimony ; and that they cannot consider themselves free from sin, if they venture to marry those who are manifestly unworthy. [1]—In what does this immediate preparation consist?

In receiving worthily the Sacrament of Penance and Holy Communion. The souls of those who are to partake of the sacramental graces imparted by the solemn blessing which seals their union before God and man, must be pure. A sincere and contrite confession, embracing a general review of the whole past, is the best beginning of this new life. Ordinarily a general confession should be advised. " Commendent parochi et confessarii sponsis, ut generali peccatorum confessione animas suas purgent, quatenus novum statum novi homines aggrediantur." [2] In some diocesan

[1] Tit. V., n. 330.

[2] *Conc. Prov. Prag.* 1860.

statutes we find the rule laid down that confession be made several days before the nuptials are solemnized. This is intended as a caution to prevent certain impediments being discovered only at the last moment. But, as we indicated already, the safest method to secure a worthy reception of the sacrament is to advise a general confession some time before the day fixed for the marriage, and to have a brief confession on the morning of the nuptial blessing, when they are to receive Holy Communion. If this be prudently insisted upon, it will have great influence in tempering the spirit of vanity and frivolity which unfortunately often accompanies the solemn act of marriage. The argument of too great excitement, of inconvenience, human respect, and the like, should be gently but firmly resisted; for the act is sacred, and we may omit nothing that can tend to secure to it a worthy treatment.

The Sacrament of Marriage is to be administered in the nuptial Mass and ordinarily only outside of the closed seasons of the ecclesiastical year. "Vehementer hortamur pastores, ut praxim benedicendi matrimonia intra missam ubique introducant."[1] The third Plenary Council insists with equal emphasis that marriages should not be celebrated in the evenings, but in the morning, with the nuptial Mass, in order that Catholics might thus profess openly their faith and the high sense they entertain concerning the dignity and sanctity of the married state. And this, continue the Fathers of the Council, is to be considered not merely as a praiseworthy custom, but rather as a necessity, especially in these days, when the sanctity of marriage is assailed by those who see in it merely a civil contract.[2] There is little

[1] Conc. Plen. Balt. II., n. 333.

[2] Frequenter et gravibus verbis inculcent pium illum et laudabilem ecclesiæ ritum, quo fideles non noctu sed missæ tempore cum benedictione nuptiali contrahunt. Qua ratione fidem suam Catholicam tacite profitentur et coram omnibus ostendunt quam alte, ut decet, ac splendide de matrimonii dignitate ac sanctitate

danger that those who have been properly instructed, according to the method suggested, will object to having their marriage thus solemnized by the nuptial Mass and the reception of Holy Communion, as is the wish of the Church. In rare cases the Mass may be dispensed with, but never from trivial reasons. In every case the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion should form the immediate preparation for the Nuptial Blessing. No personal inconvenience or feeling or exaggerated human respect should be allowed to outweigh the importance of the sacramental action, and to sanction it without grave reasons would be to lower our own ministry. It may be, indeed, that poverty prevents persons, who would otherwise be glad to have a Mass, from asking it. But when we remember that we need not forego our daily intention in celebrating Mass, that we may even lawfully apply its fruits to those who have offered a voluntary stipend, whilst we bless with the nuptial Benediction of the Church the poor who are being united in marriage, we have no reason to refuse them the privilege of performing the ceremony during the Mass. And if we offer the latter for them, proving that the Church knows no distinction between rich and poor in doling out her graces, we shall confirm our people in their attachment to that Church who has ever gloried in her special mission: prædicare evangelium pauperibus. If the question of money enters into such transactions at all, because the means are thus furnished for a decent sustenance of the holy ministry, it should certainly never have the appearance of a bargain or even a fee, but rather of an offering, the limits of which, though sometimes fixed by diocesan statute, are never to be considered as a condition of obtaining the rites of the

sentiant. Et hoc quidem non solum laude dignum sed fere necessarium videtur nostris hisce temporibus, quando nihil intentatum relinquunt religionis hostes, ut matrimonio omnis sanctitatis, omnis sacramenti species, si fieri potest, adimatur et quasi merus civilis contractus æstimetur.—

Conc. Pl. Balt. III., Tit. iv., n. 125.

Church. To exact a stipend or a promise of the same before performing the sacred act has ever been branded as a disgraceful violation of the sacerdotal duty, and in many places the pastor who does so incurs suspension from office *ipso facto*. "Si quis sacerdos, cujus erit matrimonium assistere, adeo fuerit sui sancti officii immemor ut recuset matrimonium celebrare, nisi obtenta prius aut saltem promissa certa quadam pecuniæ summa, vel alia re pretio æstimabili, suspensionem suo ordinario reservatam ipso facto incurrat?[1] Where a dispensation from the proclamation of Banns has been allowed for grave reasons, the common ecclesiastical law in the United States, sanctioned by the Holy See, enjoins that those who ask for this dispensation pay a small sum in alms to the support of some work of charity.[2] This money is ordinarily sent to the episcopal chancery when the dispensation is asked for. Otherwise no money can be accepted for granting dispensations from impediments of matrimony.

V.

The last thing is to instruct the bridegroom and bride in the ceremonies which are to be observed during the nuptial Mass, lest there be any unnecessary distractions at the solemn service. They will find kneeling desk and seat, if possible, in the sanctuary, at some distance from the altar. The bride kneels at the left of the bridegroom. The witnesses to the marriage may retain seats outside of the sanctuary, but should be instructed to approach and remain standing behind the nuptial party whenever the latter leave their place to kneel at the altar-steps, so as to be within hearing of the questions and answers by which the marriage contract is expressed. The bridegroom and bride go to the

[1] Syn Plen. Hib. III, cit. ex Wapelh. Compend. n. 290.

[2] Pro dispensationibus ab impedimentis matrimonii pecuniam nullo omnino titulo percipiendam esse jubetur, iis tantum exceptis casibus, in quibus Apostolica Sedes eleemosynam oratoribus injungendam monet, in pium aliquod opus impendendam.—Conc. Pl. Balt. III., Tit. iv., n. 134.

altar and kneel upon the (lowest) step at the beginning of the Mass; again after the "Pater Noster." Holy Communion is more properly given to them at their kneeling desk. They go to the altar a third time after the "Benedicamus Domino" or "Ite missa est," when the priest speaks to them a few heartfelt words of felicitation, reminding them once more of what they have already been told in regard to their sacred duties. Long sermons are hardly in place on these occasions, first, because the parties must before then have realized the full extent of their obligations, and secondly because they are kneeling at this time.—There should always be a ring which is to be blessed. If it be accidentally wanting, the "Benedictio annuli" is for the time omitted (it may be supplied outside of Mass), but the versicle "Confirma hoc" and what follows in the Ritual is said as usual. An old tradition, supported by eminent writers on ceremonies, forbids the use of gloves to those who approach the altar. We believe that, whilst it is entirely proper to keep the hands ungloved until after the nuptial Mass, there is no need to insist upon it in every case. The present universal use of the glove takes away from it the character of an exclusively outdoor dress, at least in this country, although it may be different in Italy and the southern countries generally.[1] After the nuptial Mass, especially if they have received Holy Communion, some time should be allowed for thanksgiving, whilst the celebrant makes his own. Then the nuptial party are invited to the sacristy, and the names of husband and wife and the witnesses are entered according to the usual form in the parish register.

[1] Martinucci says "*si forte* uterentur chirothecis," implying that it is by no means common usage, as with us.

THE STUDY OF THE CHRISTIAN FATHERS.

To you it is given to know the mystery of the Kingdom of God.—St. Luke viii. 10.

IT is said of Bossuet that he never passed a day, even during his episcopal visitations, without reading some portion from the works of St. Augustine. Most of the great minds in the Catholic Church exhibit in their writings a similar predilection for one or other of the Christian Fathers, even from the earliest times. Thus Gregory of Nyssa, though he had at his side the Great Basil, whom he loved and admired as a true brother, tells us that he holds no conversation so sweetly attractive as that to be found in the writings of the Syrian Ephrem. Nazianzen prefers Athanasius to all others. Augustine turns over and over the sayings of Ambrose, as if the living voice of the holy Bishop of Milan were still investing truth with the enchanting cadences of his matchless rhythm. Each in turn feeds his soul in the habitual reading of some one gone before, and becomes a master by the study of a master pattern. As we look upon the Christian Fathers in their entirety, they seem like the great pillars of the Church, upon which the perfect arch of unbroken tradition rises, held in place by the keystone of infallible truth. Yet, whilst they are the upholders of a perfection which is essentially immutable, they are as varied in their individuality as the wonderful groups of columns which the traveller may see in some of the Roman basilicas, fit emblems of the foundation upon which rests the throne of the Most High described by the angelic pen of St. John: "Jasper and sapphire, calcedony and emerald, sardony, sardius and chrysolite, beryl and topaz, chrysoprasus and jacinth and amethyst."[1] Through this magnificent archway we are led into the eternal Home of truth, whose beauty no mortal eye has seen, no human mind can conceive. All rest

[1] Apocal. xxi. 19, 20.

upon the same foundation. All point to the same end. But they are brought together from many climes, and they are finished in the characteristic style which befits their origin and quality. Thus the Latin Fathers are on the whole perhaps less polished than the Greeks; yet the terse eloquence of the former, showing forth the strong veins of their Roman nature, has a peculiar charm aside of the more elegant finish which captivates us in the eastern form of expression. But whether we study one or dwell in turn upon them all, as they succeed each other in gorgeous array, they lead the eye up to the keystone of true wisdom, and from that keystone we learn the secret of unbarring the gate of the heavenly Jerusalem.

For our own time the study of the Fathers is of special importance, and the fact is being daily demonstrated not only by Catholic apologists but, perhaps, even more so by Protestants who still cling to positive religion. Dogma will always have its force with minds trained to the habit of obedience; but when the principle of authority is made dependent on the judgment of those who are to submit to that authority, then dogma requires not only demonstration but a change of form and name; for prejudice fosters suspicion. The ages of faith, the times when the spirit of reckless speculation in matters of religion was confined to classes that were more or less separated from the mass of the people, has gone by. The rationalistic tendency has become endemic, and the old time remedy, which saved the people from contamination by banishing the intellectual and moral lepers from their midst, or simply forbade communication with them, has lost its virtue. To say: "This is God's teaching, and you must believe it at the peril of your souls," may be as true to-day as it was in the days of Israel in the desert, but it is not as successful. It is like attempting to frighten a man by quoting the penalty of a breach of law when he is intoxicated, or like reasoning with a child about the moral beauty of any action. You might persuade

the one by taking him gently by the arm, and convince the other by showing to it a picture. "Let him," says Father Hecker,[1] "who would serve the Catholic Church in this generation, show her in her own true light, in her unity and universality, in all her beauty and majesty. It is this true vision of her divinity that will captivate man's intelligence, secure the unbidden homage of his will, and elicit his most heroic devotedness. Herein lies the mysterious force of her duration for so many centuries, the secret of the power of her sway over more than two hundred millions of souls, and the reason for the never-broken stream of her converts and the capture of the ablest and noblest minds of our century." The writer appeals in this passage against the exaggerated assertion of authority which is sometimes made by the defenders of the Catholic principle, as likely to do more harm than good. If the Church claims divine authority for her mission as teacher and lawgiver, that claim is not the only prerogative which she enjoys and by which she draws and binds the souls of men to herself. And in these days of a universal reaction from state-bondage, with which religion has in the past been too often identified, nothing is more apt to be misunderstood by a freedom-loving people, unprejudiced by any tradition, than that the claim of the Church over the conscience must overrule all other claims. Certainly, as representative of the highest Legislator, she must needs have rights over man which, whether he respects them or not, are supreme; yet it is neither necessary nor wise to thrust this fact into the faces of men who on the whole have no objection to abide by reasonable laws, but who do not see the need of being warned of a penalty until they have shown a disposition to disregard them. There is another way of forcing subjection of heart and mind to the truth taught by the Catholic Church. It is the way which Father Hecker has pointed out, and it is the way which is best illustrated in the works of the

[1] The Church and the Age, p. 205.

Christian Fathers. They addressed for the most part generations whose tendencies were in many respects like those of our own day—a practical pantheism clothed in one form or other of vague religious belief.

In the writings of the Fathers we find collected all the doctrines and facts of Christianity, or better, of Catholicity. Yet the method is throughout not so much dogmatic as rather apologetic. This is what suits the spirit of our time and race. It has been often said by those who came from foreign parts, professedly to make a diagnosis of our people, that there prevails among Americans as a class a keen appreciation of high moral standards; that to freedom of speech and criticism they join an honest readiness to admit and second those who can establish their claim as professors of what is good or true. The Catholic Church teaches nowhere anything that does not appeal to a candid mind as good and true. But in the process of bringing home truth to those who are wholly ignorant of it or doubt it, we must begin with the good. We must pre-occupy the heart, and thus reach the intellect, that the will may be disposed. The mind is much like the eye. It cannot see unless it find congenial light throwing its warm rays around an object. In thought and feeling, in word and action, the Church has left her image in the works of the Fathers. In teaching the Scriptures, she listens to the harmonious voices of these masters in the sacred sciences to interpret those doubtful texts which without their lucid explanations would have made her part of the contending body of sectaries. If by decree of council she defines a truth which, though implied in her previous doctrine, needs a stronger and more emphatic expression, in order to be protected against the assumptions of mere human wisdom or pride, she appeals to the concordant testimony of the Fathers. Her code of morals and discipline is everywhere confirmed and illustrated by maxims from these same sources, which contain the experience of ages and bear the seal of supernatural wisdom. All

the branches of sacred knowledge are there represented. Taking them at random, we have among them models of pastors and pontiffs like Gregory and Athanasius, preachers like Ambrose and Chrysostom, theologians to wield the sword of controversy like Augustine and Epiphanius, ascetical writers and students of Holy Writ such as Jerome and Theodoret. Yet all these qualities together may be predicated of each, though not in the same degree. Nor are they, in dealing with the same subjects, at all alike in their manner. St. Basil, full of erudition, covers a wide field and abounds in sound precepts of the spiritual life, whilst Nazianzen, more profound, enters into the mysteries of that same life, until the depth makes one, unaccustomed to such mental distances, giddy in the attempt to follow him. Simple and plain, steadily moving toward the point of his argument, St. Athanasius impresses us with the aptness and weight of his words, whilst Epiphanius advances with step quick and sharp, and mercilessly overturns the perverter of truth. St. John Damascene, learned and clear in the exposition of dogma, is hardly less attractive than his namesake St. Chrysostom, whose golden tongue still draws the hearer, as Orpheus of old, by the sweet melody of his well-tempered language. Among the Latins Cyprian excels in the copiousness of his speech, yet it is full of dignity, because almost each single word contains a weighty truth, and St. Jerome compares him to a limpid fountain of pure water, whilst St. Augustine styles him the sweetest of teachers (doctorem suavissimum). Aside of St. Ambrose, choice and rhythmic in language and full of doctrine, so that he has been alternately styled the theological orator and the eloquent theologian, we may place St. Jerome. Inconsistent as a lover, he yet remains the lover at all times, whether, aflame with divine fire, he smites the adversary of truth without as well as within the Church, or in gentlest and touching affection pours forth his tears and his grief upon the tomb of a noble friend. And so it is with all of them.

It may be said that we have models of a later day, and that we might rightly inform our minds and fashion the inclinations of our hearts after the manner of those who are nearer to us in time and circumstances of life. Perhaps we may find the models, but the old ones that have stood the test of ages are there. They represent not individual greatness. As they have come down to us, they represent principles rather than facts. The distance gives us the power of abstraction, and thus enhances that of our judgment, whilst we lose not the sight of our proportion. Military men, like Napoleon or Moltke, perfected their strategic talent and made it useful for practical service by the study of the journeys of Cyrus and the gesta of Alexander the Great. Our great lawyers habitually search the old codices of Roman law to find themselves right. Lord Tennyson tells us that he obtained his facility of rhythmic writing from the habit as a boy of committing to memory the odes of Horace. What public orator of note is there who has not given years to the study of Cicero among the preceptors of eloquence, and what philosopher is there whose system is not overturned by the vagaries of his disciples, unless he appeal to Aristotle and Plato as the foundation of his method of reasoning. Now the priest is in most cases required to possess the gifts or accomplishments of the soldier, the judge, the dialectician, the orator. "Ars artium est regimen animarum." He is to rule, to teach, to defend. And he will find the means to perfect himself in these accomplishments, which are part of his profession, and which he may be called upon at all times and without special warning to exercise, by the habitual study of the Christian Fathers. Take only the writings which particularly treat of the sacerdotal dignity and functions, such as the work of Ephrem of Edessa on the priesthood, or that of St. Ambrose, wherein he mentions the famous saying, that "the power of speech in the priest depends on his ability to be silent," or the golden book of St. Chrysostom *De Sacerdotio*, or the well-written letters

of St. Jerome on the life of clerics, wherein he portrays with matchless irony the habits of priests in his own day as one might have met them less than a century ago in France and elsewhere, effeminate, with curled and oiled hair, scented handkerchiefs, perfumed notes, and sentimental flippancies in the boudoirs of highborn ladies, and other criminal follies. There is a long line of pastoral writers, down to the days of Peter Damien and St. Bernard, whose treatise *De Conversione ad Clericos* so touched the priests at Paris, to whom it was delivered, that at the conclusion of it many resolved to leave the world forever.

But apart from their being books of spiritual reading, whence may be drawn precepts of right living given in tones at once engaging and dignified, appealing to reason whilst they touch the heart, the Fathers offer a solid ground for the study of theology. In this respect some lines of limitation must naturally be drawn; but it is comparatively easy to make a selection for that purpose, and a good book on Patrology, such as the *Institutiones* of Bishop Fessler, a good edition of which is now being published by Dr. Jungmann of the Louvain University, or any similar work, will greatly aid the student to a systematic pursuit in that direction. Again, the study of the Fathers is a considerable aid to the understanding of Church-history. They reflect in turn the spirit of their age. We understand much better, than by a continuous reading of gesta and annals, the bearing of canons, the use of exceptional rites and discipline, the meaning of peculiar devotions which are still practised without an apparent object to warrant their existence. They show the development of doctrine, and their writings throw a direct light upon the legislation of councils in all ages. For, as Pallavicini aptly remarks in speaking of the Synod of Trent, it neither prescribes nor restricts by new laws the interpretation which we are to give to the revealed word of God. It simply declares that interpretation which has been given it by the universal testimony of the Fathers of the Church.

And in proportion as new forms of doctrine show a departure from this combined testimony, are they condemned as heretical or pronounced as alien to the Catholic sense of faith, or the contrary opinion is simply affirmed as conformable to pious belief and tradition. "Qui vero ab unanimi Patrum consensu discedit, ab universa ecclesia recedit."[1] That one or other of the Fathers are sometimes cited against a doctrine signifies nothing. The Church does not look upon them as individually inspired, but only as giving expression to the general belief of their times, and therefore as proper channels of tradition in uninterrupted series since apostolic times. And in no case does she define her teaching upon the testimony of a single or even a few representatives.

Furthermore, the preacher as well as the catechist will find in the works of the Christian Fathers a storehouse of the best material for his instructions. Even the form, the simple homiletic style which many of them adopted in their preaching, communicates to the frequent reader something of their earnestness and unction. The earlier Christian writers seem to have designedly avoided the arts of the Greek and Roman rhetoricians, because this elegancy of oratorical discipline was so intimately bound up with the pride of the Augustan civilization. Their apostolic simplicity of speech was a protest, as it were, against the old ideals, and it served to mark the contrast between Christian truth and pagan sophistry clad in the garb of fair-sounding words. But in the fourth century, when the memories of the golden age had almost died away, when the strange tales of heroism and sacrifice among the Christians, daily demonstrated anew to the growing generation of Romans, had dulled the traditions concerning Tully's magic flow of speech and the charms of the Mantuan swan—then began a golden period of Christian oratory and Christian poetry. Lactantius arose and spoke in language which has given him the name of the Christian

[1] S. Aug. C. Jul. ii. 37.

Cicero. And a long line of eloquent and polished writers follows in the train—Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Leo, Peter, Chrysologus, Gregory, Hilary of Poitiers and his namesake of Arles, Sulpicius Severus, Paulinus, Vincence of Lerins, Prosper, Cassian, Cassiodorus, and others. And in the East, where culture had ever been far in advance of Rome, but where it ceased when the proud mistress of the pagan world came to her doom, Christianity awakened new energy as soon as it had gained firm footing. The ancient beauty of the Greek mind, native to the soil, showed itself anew in the magnificent and thoughtful eloquence of Christian bishops like Athanasius, Ephrem, Basil, the two Gregorys of Nyssa and Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Makarius, Epiphanius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Isidor of Pelusium, and Nilus, who has been called the Christian Cato. As catechists some of the Fathers are incomparably superior to those later writers who have adopted professedly scientific methods. We may mention especially the writings of Clement of Alexandria, of Cyril of Jerusalem, of Chrysostom, and perhaps best of them all St. Augustine, in his *De catechizandis rudibus*, *Enchiridion*, *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, *De Fide et Operibus*, and *De Agone Christiano*.

We must for the present conclude our subject, hoping to return to it in the next number of the Review, where we shall point out some of the aids, practically at the command of the missionary priest, to the study of the Christian Fathers. It may be that he who, accepting the judgment of the learned of all ages and countries as to the excellency of this study of the Christian Fathers, will nevertheless find some difficulty in developing an appreciation of and taste for their writings. This is to be expected. It is here as in the case of the old masterpieces of art. They must be looked at from the point of view in which they were conceived, which may not be the one we are accustomed to. They require a certain preparatory training, a divesting of conventional prej-

udices. In brief, they must be studied, not merely glanced at. We do form our estimate of the character of a foreigner from his outward appearance or manner in first meeting us; but if we have reason to think that his society will be profitable to us from a moral or intellectual standpoint, we seek to become more closely acquainted with him. So it is precisely with the Christian Fathers. They are an old nobility, approved in many a battle, perhaps a trifle quaint, but with good blood and sound ideas. If we are happy enough in our first choice to find a writer who particularly suits our temper of soul, a taste is quickly developed drawing us to the appreciation of the rest. Sometimes an odd sentence from one of the Fathers makes us recognize in him an apt teacher for ourselves. If we follow him up, convinced that no perfection can be acquired in any direction except by assiduous work and attention at the start, but that, when once we have gained a certain facility of understanding our master, this kind of labor becomes the keenest enjoyment—then we are in the way of finding pearls of priceless value. "The wise man will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients;.... he will keep the sayings of renowned men."[1]

Martyres contempserunt vitam, contemne tu delicias; projecerunt illi corpora in ignem; projice tu pecunias in pauperum manus; prunas illi calcarunt; tu cupiditatis flammam extingue. Laboriosa sunt ista et difficilia, sed utilia admodum; noli præsentia acerba spectare, sed jucunda futura. Non quæ in manibus mala, sed quæ in spe bona: non passiones, sed præmia: non labores, sed coronas: non ignem urentem, sed propositum regnum: non carnifices circumstantes, sed Christum coronantem.

St. Joannes Chrysostomus (Homil. 74 de SS. Martyr.).

[1] Ecclus. xxxix. 1, 2.

THE RIGHTS OF PRIESTS WHO HAVE RETIRED FROM THE MISSION. [1]

THE Council of Trent provides that no cleric be ordained unless he have a title ; that is to say, he must have a definite prospect of an honorable support, which would shield him from the necessity of having either to beg or to engage in pursuits unbecoming his sacred calling. With the secular clergy this support is usually drawn from the church or other ecclesiastical charge to which they are appointed by their Ordinary. There are other titles of ordination, such as membership in a religious community, patrimony, or the various kinds of founded benefices, which we pass over as alien to our purpose here. In the United States priests are generally ordained under what is termed a *Titulus Missionis.* The bishop assures them of sufficient and lasting (congrua et perpetua) support, and they in turn pledge themselves to devote their talents and strength to the work of the missions as long as they are able, and in the way and place which the bishop may appoint. Nor can they lawfully vacate a charge at any time without the express consent of the Ordinary, as the Holy See has repeatedly decided in reference to missionary priests in the United States, and as is likewise clear from the terms

[1] The following letter will explain the purpose and scope of the above article. We omit the signature, as it would add nothing to the matter and may not be desired by our Reverend Correspondent.

" REV. DEAR SIR :—I respectfully call your attention to a letter which I wrote to you in January, 1889. . . . The subject in brief was this : What right have priests who have honorably retired after a life-long service in the ministry, in regard to celebrating Mass in a private chapel—their own house and property ? Can the bishop deny them this privilege or censure them for using it ? What is the Church-law on this subject ? Since I wrote to you, half a dozen priests, pioneers of religion in this state, have retired, who, on account of no rule being clearly laid down in this matter, find themselves in the pitiable condition of having to apply at the parish-church every time they wish to say Mass. . . ."

of the promise of obedience made at the time of ordination. On the other hand, it appears from the canons, that the bishop is bound to provide the means of honorable subsistence to priests who, having served the Church for a time, are no longer able to do so, whether by reason of old age, or infirmity, or other legitimate cause. This obligation seems to extend even to delinquents when they are not contumacious, if we judge from various decisions of the S. Congregation and the general tenor of ecclesiastical law; and we may say here in passing that we believe the words of the Second Plenary Council "nullum habent jus ad sustentationem ab eo *petendam*" [1] can be made to harmonize with the Canons of Trent in this sense, that priests who have proved themselves unworthy to administer a missionary charge forfeit all claim to salary or benefice, and that, if they are provided for in a monastery or otherwise, having "quod ad victum honestum sufficiat," so that they be not "obliged to wander homeless through the world, and beg or exercise some menial employment unbecoming to and lowering their sacred ministry, and being a scandal to the faithful," [2] they have no further demands to make.

When a priest withdraws from the mission he thereby gives up his faculties, which were delegated "in animarum salutem," and imply jurisdiction. And in this respect, because he has no longer any duties, he also loses the corresponding rights, except such as may be allowed him by the bishop or pastor within whose jurisdiction he resides. But the privilege of saying Mass is not considered as a faculty like those of which a priest may be deprived when he has resigned the charge for whose benefit they were given him. To prohibit a priest from saying Mass is to censure him, whilst the withholding of faculties is simply to

[1] Conc. Plen. Balt. II., Decr. Tit. II., n. 77.

[2] Per sæculum vagentes, vel mendicare, vel sordidum questum exercere, non sine ipsorum dedecore ac ordinis vilipendio et quam plurimorum Christifidelium scandalo cogantur.—Bull. Pii V., *Roman. Pont.*

abstain from delegating a power for the exercise of which there is no call. But whilst it may always be taken for granted that a priest not under censure, or, as our case implies, one who with the consent of his bishop has honorably retired from the mission, is at liberty to say Mass whenever he can do so, it is quite another question *where or in what places* Mass may be lawfully celebrated.

Without an Indult from the Holy See, Mass cannot be lawfully celebrated in a private oratory, nor in any place except a church or public oratory. "In privato oratorio cui ecclesiæ nomen non convenit, sine speciali S. Sedis Indulto vetita est missarum celebratio." [1] By private oratories, as distinct from public oratories, are here meant such as have no entrance for the public, but are mainly intended for personal and domestic accommodation. According to various decrees of the S. Congregation, this does not include the chapels of seminaries, colleges, religious houses, nor those of hospitals, orphanages, and prisons, which are considered public oratories. [2] Nor can bishops grant this permission to others, though they enjoy it for themselves even outside the limits of their diocese. Pius VII, in an apostolic letter to the Neapolitan clergy, declares emphatically that the practice which some of them claimed as a right upon an alleged concession made by Leo X, of celebrating Mass in the private oratories of their houses, is an abuse and a misinterpretation of the original indult. [3] And Gardellini, remarking on a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, [4] says: "Intra privatæ domus parietes, nemo præter Romanum Pontificem indulgere potest, ut domestica oratoria, ad ibi Sacrum faciendum, erigantur." The question was put in another and still more direct form: "An episcopi non

[1] Cf. Trid., Sess. XXII., Decr. de obs. et vit. in celebr. miss.

[2] Idemque profecto tenendum de domibus ad exercitia spiritualia paratis dummodo sint domus religiosæ ad præfatum usum tantummodo destinatæ.—Cf. Mühlb., Decreta auth., Suppl. II., Orator. a priv., p. 705.

[3] Lit. Ap. Pii VII., 19 Apr. 1816. [4] Decr. auth. 11 Mart. 1820; n. 4565 ad X.

habentes facultatem specialem concedendi in oratoriis privatis et capellis pro sæcularibus et aliis legendi Missam possint licentiam dictam petentibus concedere? The answer was: Negative.[1] In cases where bishops had granted such permission without special recourse each time to the Holy See, it was declared as revoked and annulled, since the Council of Trent, by Paul V, again by Clement XI, and lately by a decree of the S. Congregation in answer to a doubt proposed by the Bishop of Münster.[2]

The question has been raised whether cases of grave necessity, for example, to give a dying person the viaticum when the Church is far away, or there is danger in going to it, as during time of war or persecution, would warrant a bishop to give the permission or a priest to presume upon it, of celebrating in a private oratory. Barbosa cites a number of good authorities in favor of the affirmative opinion, although he does not espouse the same, and Gattico, treating professedly of the subject, says, that a bishop could give such permission in a case where the spiritual welfare of many persons is concerned, and no church exists or can be built. Benedict XIV, in a letter to the Bishops of Servia, in the dominion of the Turcs, says under this head: "Extra summum necessitatis casum apud infirmos in ædibus non sacratis missam celebrare non licet."[3]

But this does not cover the case of a priest who is sick and unable to leave his house for the purpose of saying Mass, unless he be in danger of death. A bishop who believed that in cases of infirm priests he could grant them the privilege of saying Mass in their own houses, was told

[1] S. R. C. Die 20 Sept. 1749, ad VII.—In Taurin.

[2] S. C. C. de mandato Paul V, P. M., 15 Oct. 1615, irritavit licentias omnes celebrandi in Oratoriis privatis ab Episcopis concessas et expresse prohibuit, ne hujusmodi licentias concedere auderent. Idem repetit decretum Clem. XI, 14 Dec. 1703, et denuo confirmat S. C. C. 1 Feb. 1847, in resp. ad Episc. Monastericens.—Cf. Decr. auth.. Mühlb., II., p. 161, Missa, licentia celebrandi.

[3] Bened. XIV, in Const diei 2 Feb. 1744, n. 22.

that such power belonged exclusively to the Holy See.[1] Many other passages might be cited to show that the whole tenor of legislation on this subject is to inculcate great care as regards the place in which the Holy Mysteries are to be celebrated. Nevertheless, since the Bl. Eucharist and the Holy Sacrifice have been instituted for the benefit of men, all these restrictions, intended to guard the reverence due to them, must yield to the spiritual necessities of the faithful. Hence, in the days of persecution, Mass was celebrated in any place where it could be done with safety. Hence, also, in missionary countries, where the poverty of the people or other social conditions have made it advisable, the Church has dispensed with the general law of having Mass celebrated only in places exclusively designated and consecrated for that purpose. We may here remark that private or domestic oratories, even if the Holy See grant the permission to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice therein, may never be consecrated.

In the United States, as in other missionary countries, bishops have from the first the faculty of granting permission to celebrate Mass anywhere, provided it be a decent place, even in the open air or under the ground. Form I. of our general faculties, number 23, contains the words: "Celebrandi sub dio et sub terra, in loco tamen decenti." The First Provincial Council of Baltimore, in one of its decrees,[2] is sufficiently explicit to show in what sense this faculty is intended to be used, and that it does not authorize Mass to be said habitually in private oratories, for the personal benefit of the priest, or his immediate household, or particular individuals, even where we might suppose that the Ordinary were inclined to grant such a privilege. "No priest is by reason of the general faculties allowing him to celebrate in

[1] "Potestas qua putat orator Episcopus gaudere concedendi infirmis sacerdotibus licentias hujusmodi solo Romano Pontifici est reservata."—Conf. Decr. authent. cit., suppl., II., p. 703.

[2] Decret. XXIII.

any becoming place empowered to say Mass in private houses, except such as are missionary stations or which the Ordinary has designated; and only for the time during which he actually exercises his missionary functions at a distance from any church. And if the bishop, owing to the particular circumstances, grant leave to celebrate in a private house, he is to do so only 'pro una vel altera vice.'" [1]

Enough has been said to show that in the matter of saying Mass out of devotion we are in the same position as the laity, who are obliged, so long as they are able, to go to the church if they wish to receive Holy Communion, nor could we bring it to their houses in such cases. In cases of sickness or old age, which would still allow a priest to say Mass, though he might not be able to leave his house, application to convert a private oratory into a chapel for the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries has to be made to the Holy See. This would be *a fortiori* the case where reasons of mere inconvenience prevent a priest from going to the nearest church or chapel.

Quia veram requiem, quæ post hanc vitam promittitur, quæris, etiam hic eam inter amarissimas vitæ hujus molestias, suavem jucundamque gustabis, si ejus qui eam promisit præcepta dilexeris. Cito enim senties dulciores esse fructus justitiæ, quam iniquitatis; et verius ac jucundius gaudere hominem de bona conscientia inter molestias, quam de mala inter delicias.

St. Augustinus (De catechizandis rudibus, cap. 16).

[1] Statuimus sacerdoti nulli, vi facultatum generalium sibi concessarum celebrandi in quocumque loco decenti, licere missam celebrare in ædibus privatis, nisi in stationibus, et in iis ædibus quas Ordinarius designaverit; aut dum, actu, missionis exercitiis, procul ab aliqua ecclesia, dat operam. Quod si Ordinarii alias concedant licentiam celebrandi in privatis ædibus, ob speciales circumstantias, iis commendamus eam pro una tantum vel altera vice concedere.—*Decr. Conc. Pro. Balt.* I., a. 1829, n. 23.

DE JUSTITIA ET GRATIA DIVINA CIRCA INFANTES SINE BAPTISMO DECEDENTES.

(*The following difficulty with annexed queries has been sent us with a request to have it answered in the "Review." It must be evident that the question covers a wide range, and we believe that in his reply the Rev. L. V. McCabe, to whom we entrusted the solution, has been as brief as the nature of the case admits.*[1]—*Editor, Am. Eccl. Review.*)

"Ut Deus sit justus in actu creationis tenetur omnibus gratiam sufficientem proferre. Sed animabus (infantibus?) jam in utero defunctis hæc gratia denegatur. Ergo Deus non est justus.

Quæritur 1° Num Deus his animabus sufficientem gratiam dat?

2° Quomodo—et

3° An hæc gratia accipiatur directe vel indirecte, sive per se vel per alium, v. g., per matrem?

Respondetur ad argumentum negando majorem. Gratia enim ex ipsa vi nominis est donum gratuitum et nullo modo ex justitia debitum. "Alioquin gratia jam non est gratia." —Rom. xi. 6.

Datur, sed non conceditur minor, et negatur consequens.

Quod Deus ex justitia, sive ut justus sit, ad gratiam dandam non teneatur, nulla indiget vel probatione vel explicatione; patet enim per se. Dici autem potest Deum, non quidem ex justitia, sed ex summa sua bonitate et misericordia omnibus gratiam promisisse (quippe qui per apostolos dicit se omnes homines velle salvos fieri, aliquos perire nolle, etc.) et promissa sua non posse non adimplere. Certissime equidem constat Deum quæcumque promiserit adimplere. Quid vero reipsa promiserit haud ita liquet. Deus utique vult omnes homines salvos fieri; at hæc voluntas non est

[1] We take this occasion to supply an omission which occurred in a paper "De Dispensationum validitate" (March, 1890), by the same writer. The article had been signed at our request, but the name was accidentally omitted in print.

simplex et absoluta (sic enim omnes actu salvarentur) sed consequens et conditionata. "In omni locutione," ait vetus auctor, "sensus et conditio latet; unde dicit Petrus apostolus: Omnis scriptura indiget interpretatione. Vult enim Deus omnes homines salvos fieri, sed si accedant ad eum; non enim sic vult, ut nolentes salventur: sed vult illos salvari, si et ipsi velint." Quænam autem conditiones voluntati Dei salvificæ apponantur aut quomodo præcise iste textus S. Pauli ad Timotheum et alii similes intelligendi sint, valde inter se discrepant theologi. Qui dicuntur Thomistæ et Augustinianenses fere omnes in ea sunt sententia quæ statuit "a Deo denegari obduratis, et excæcatis, ac infidelibus qui nihil unquam de fide audierunt, etiam sufficientia auxilia, quibus converti aut credere possint." Hi S. Augustinum sequentes vocem "omnes" in textu allato vel de omnibus qui salvantur vel de aliquibus omnis generis, conditionis et nationis hominum aut alio simili modo explicare nituntur et facile quidem concedunt vel potius asserunt infantibus in utero defunctis non dari gratiam quæ vere ad salutem sufficiat. Ceteri vero theologi, qui voluntatem Dei salvificam vere universalem esse contendunt atque omnibus et singulis hominibus, etiam obduratis, infidelibus, etc., gratiam sufficientem dari censent, difficultatem explicandi casum istum infantium et cum sua sententia conciliandi ultro fatentur. Alii alio respondent; plerique tamen agnoscunt gratiam *ipsis* infantibus non dari, at salutem eorum Deum quidem velle, sed ita ut hæc pendeat a cura et diligentia parentum et aliorum atque a legibus etiam ordinis naturalis, quas generatim propter ea mutari non vult; ac ne hoc mirum videatur, salutem adultorum quoque animadvertunt magna ex parte pendere a vita, exemplo, et voluntate aliorum, atque a causis etiam physicis, propter quas, v. g., homo hoc vel illo tempore potius quam alio moriatur, etc. Hic addere fortasse licet Ecclesiam de statu infantium qui sine baptismo decedant nullam hactenus expressam edidisse definitionem. Definitum quidem est eos contraxisse peccatum originis et in

concilio Florentino decretum est "illorum animas, qui in actuali mortali peccato, vel solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, pœnis tamen disparibus puniendas." Ex hoc decreto inferendum videtur quosdam ex hac vita decedere solo inquinatos peccato originali. Hoc tamen expresse non asseritur, et propositio incidens, stricte loquendo, haberi forte potest ut priori æquivalens parti enunciationis hypotheticæ. Quidquid vero hac de re sentiatur, certe ex istis et aliis hujusmodi decretis non sequitur omnes qui sine baptismo decedant esse perituros. Quamquam enim sacramentum baptismi Christus instituit tanquam medium regenerationis et salutis ordinarium, potest tamen absque sacramento hac gratia donare quos velit. Potentia enim Dei, juxta vulgatum in scholis axioma, "sacramentis visibilibus non alligatur." Utrum vero et quoties hoc velit quoad infantes qui in uteris moriantur, an, v. g., ob vota ac preces parentum vel aliorum, hoc nos latere voluit; nam voluntatem suam hac in re non revelavit.

Objicietur procul dubio Christum ipsum suam voluntatem satis clare declarasse et quæstionem negative resolvisse, cum dixerit ad Nicodemum: "Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei."—Joan. iii. 5.

At si hæc verba tam generaliter accipienda sint quam objectio supponit, nec flaminis baptismus qui dicitur nec qui sanguinis vocatur, sufficeret ad salutem; nam in neutro habetur sacramentum et regeneratio quæ, ut apud omnes in confesso est, in istis fit, licet sit ex Spiritu sancto, non tamen est ex *aqua* et Spiritu sancto. Hic S. Augustinum laudare juvat, qui de martyrio ita scribit: "Quicumque etiam non percepto regenerationis lavacro pro Christi confessione moriuntur, tantum eis valet ad dimittenda peccata, quantum si abluerentur sacro fonte baptismatis. Qui enim dixit: *Si quis non renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu sancto, non intrabit in regnum cœlorum*, alia sententia istos fecit exceptos, ubi non minus generaliter ait: *Qui me confessus fuerit coram homini-*

bus, confitebor et ego eum coram patre meo qui in cœlis est; et alio loco: *Qui perdiderit animam suam propter me, inveniet eam,* etc.—"De Civitate Dei," xiii. 7. Idem, "Contra Donatist.," iv. 22, dicit: "Invenio non tantum passionem pro nomine Christi, id quod ex baptismo deerat posse supplere; sed etiam fidem conversionemque cordis, si forte ad celebrandum mysterium baptismi in angustiis temporum succurri non potest..... sed tunc impletur invisibiliter, cum mysterium baptismi, non contemptus religionis, sed articulus necessitatis excludit." Alios citare supervacaneum est; nam sententia est communis. Patet igitur sententiam Christi apud Joannem, iii. 5, non ita generalem esse ut exceptiones non admittat, vel potius ad unum Nicodemum directe referri, ad alios indirecte; et quod lex sit generalis, cognoscitur tum ex aliis S. Scripturæ locis tum ex traditione et praxi Ecclesiæ.

An vero exceptionibus istis includantur etiam infantes in utero defuncti vel alias prius quam baptizari queant decedentes, ob fidem scilicet vel preces et vota parentum aut aliorum, Ecclesia haud determinavit. Quod nonnulli saltem salutem ita consequantur, theologi quidam pauci magni nominis opinantur; ceteri autem, numero longe majores, aliter sentiunt. Ex his pauci admodum nunc sunt qui censeant infantes pœnas inferni sentire vel aliquam sensus pœnam pati; plerique scilicet existimant eos soli pœnæ damni, id est, carentiæ visionis Dei beatificæ obnoxios esse, eos ob hanc carentiam seu exclusionem ulla tristitia vel dolore affici plures negant, imo sunt qui naturali quadam beatitudine eos donandos esse putent.

Nunc demum ad quæsita respondere licet:—

Ad primum: probabilius saltem talem gratiam ipsis non dat.

Ad secundum et tertium: vel nullo modo, vel per directam sancti Spiritus operationem, licet ob fidem ac preces seu vota matris aut aliorum.

L. V. McCabe.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF MORAL THEOLOGY.

Theologia moralis fundamentalis auctore Thoma Jos. Bouquillon, S.T.D., et in Universitate Catholica Americana Theologiæ Moralis Professore. Editio secunda recognita et adaucta.—Brugis. 1890.

IT is said of Suarez that when, having finished the law course at the University of Salamanca, he entered upon the study of philosophy in the novitiate of the Jesuits, he found it so difficult to master the principles of this science that he asked to be dispensed from attending the classes. An old Jesuit professor intimated his conviction that the youth merely lacked a certain preparation necessary to the right appreciation of the abstract sciences, and that for the rest he possessed sufficient talent. P. Rodriguez (not to be confounded with St. Alphonsus Rodriguez, who lived during the same period) took charge of young Suarez and tutored him for a time, until he had become accustomed to a right method of study in this branch. We all know what was the result, and to what gigantic heights he reached precisely in the mastery of those principles which St. Thomas had indeed formulated with matchless precision, but which no one has explained in more lucid terms than the "Doctor eximius," or, as Suarez was called by his contemporaries, "hujus ætatis prodigium et oraculum."

This preparation, which is found necessary in the study of the scholastic disciplines generally, is no less required in the science of Moral Theology, at least as it presents itself at the present day. Formerly the maxims of the Gospel, interpreted and confirmed by a well-authenticated tradition, and the ecclesiastical canons, which gradually shaped themselves into a definite code of law, were sufficient to guide the teachers of truth and the moderators of consciences. In modern times all this has changed. Experimental science

together with other causes has produced a sceptical temper in society which challenges the veracity of the old sources of truth and questions the correctness of time-honored methods by which to attain certitude. For ourselves, it is true, we must hold that the principles of Moral Theology have changed in nothing from the beginning. Divine revelation, right reason, man in the supernatural order—these are the facts, the immovable points in the triangle around which the circle of this moral science is described. Nevertheless this science is eminently progressive. It has numberless points of tangency outside of itself, which constantly create new relations towards the three points of the triangle, suggesting new ways of demonstrating old truths and actually formulating new theorems. The secular sciences,—physics, philology, history, and their cognate branches,—as they develop under the active and searching mind of man, call forth correlative developments in Moral Theology; for the latter deals wholly with man's final end, towards which all his activity must converge. The science of Moral Theology can shirk no difficulties arising out of this activity, and it must take into account not only facts but fancy as well. The vagaries of the speculative mind, influencing the heart and the will, present themselves at the tribunal of the moral theologian, and await his sentence. To him belongs the touch-stone which will test the false and the true.

If we look over the past history of Moral Theology, in its gradual development from apostolic times through the patristic age, the scholastic period, and the modern schools up to to-day, we become at once convinced of the fact that the Church has constantly realized this her position towards the outer world. Whilst invariably keeping to her centre, infallible truth, every part of her perfect circumference has been and is constantly in touch with those numberless arts of the secular life, which for light and orderly movements depend on her, as the planets depend on the sun, even though they appear to have their own ways. From time to time, as

questions and difficulties arise in the moral order, the ablest theological minds enter the arena to discuss them. In the winnowing of conflicting opinions, the weightier arguments, like the good grain, maintain their ground in the Church, whilst the chaff is blown out of her gates. Men holy and learned are never wanting to gather the good grain and to embody it in approved teaching, and by precepts and illustration to feed the minds of others with healthy doctrine. "Dicendum est" remarks Suarez aptly "de ecclesia Christi, successu temporum crevisse in sapientia rerum divinarum acquisita, mediante fide .... advenientibus aliis illustribus doctoribus."

No better confirmation of what we have said could be found than the work which lies before us: *Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis* by Dr. Bouquillon; and we hail it as not the least of the many evidences of God's special designs in behalf of the American Church, that so able and highminded a theologian should be the first to grace the chair of Moral Theology in the Catholic University of America. Nor can we look upon it as a mere accident that the study of Fundamental Moral Theology is thus brought into prominence amongst us. In one sense it is carrying out the designs of Leo XIII when he invites us to secure the foundations of the religious and social edifice of modern times in returning to the principles laid down in the "Summa," and to build upon the model of the scholastic system, using at the same time the material which is fresh and lies closely at hand. And no better way could be found among us of doing this than by the study of Fundamental Moral Theology, which is more inviting, because more directly practical to the American mind, than the abstract sciences of the schools. That there is a necessity of returning and keeping close to the principles of Catholic Theology no one will doubt who watches the effects of the atmosphere of freedom and the rapid growth of modern thought upon those who lack a sound Christian education. The most gifted mind is power-

less to withstand the intoxicating influence of modern ideas without the antidote of the Catholic principle of right and authority. The great heresies of all ages, as well as the false inferences which have been drawn from unguarded doctrines of magnificent intellects and saintly souls, such as Rosmini in our own day, may be traced in most cases to a defect in early training according to the safe and fundamental principles of truth as we find them in St. Thomas. With us, mild heresies, preached through Catholic organs, are not so rare as well informed theologians might wish, and if good names go sponsors for the errors which are cast about we can only find an excuse in the fact that catechetical and theological training has hitherto had to yield a trifle more to practical demands than is just. Where knowledge is superficial, there is always the danger that practice will make the theory, instead of the reverse being the case. And in morals such line of conduct is disastrous alike to the individual who espouses it and to the society which he may direct or influence. Nor is it enough that the student of Moral Theology content himself with committing to memory the principles laid down in every good text book, or have read attentively a large number of cases of conscience. The director of souls to day needs more. He requires not only certain dispositions of soul, which will protect his judgment, but he must be familiar with varied positive knowledge lying properly outside of the domain of morals. All this Dr. Bouquillon inculcates with admirable precision. Having put the student into the right mood of appreciating truth by bidding him lay aside all that may interfere with his reverence for the divine law, perfect sincerity, and absolute freedom from prejudice, he leads him through the antechambres of philosophy, dogma, jurisprudence, history, into the presence of the principal study. At the threshold he defines its nature and scope, shows its various relations to other practical sciences, develops a method of study, and with the skill begotten by many years of experience in

teaching, points out the sources whence the student may safely draw his material. His own method is the best exemplification of the precepts which he gives. Whilst it may be truly said of him that he is *nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri*, he gives evidence everywhere of his eminent power of discrimination. Before him he keeps the three great masters in the science and art of Moral Theology. These are: St. Thomas, the *facile princeps* in the faculty of digesting moral truth into distinct principles; Suarez, whom no one excels in the luminous exposition of these same principles; and St. Alphonsus, the peerless Doctor, whose heavenly prudence shields him from misapplying in practice the principles of Moral Theology. Aside of the striking erudition of which Dr. Bouquillon's work gives undoubted proof, nothing impresses one so much as the thorough conservatism which he maintains in his evidence for or against certain opinions of theologians. To judge the man from the book—and we have not the advantage of knowing him otherwise—we would say that he has no passions, unless the love for truth be accounted such. By the side of the illustrious Ballerini, he appears the very opposite in temper, forging his judgments not so much with the eye of a keen critic who realizes his own superiority, as rather with the deliberate air of one who, having watched for years the strife of contending parties, has formed his judgment without predisposition or attachment to any particular school or author. He takes account of all important assertions of theologians, takes the pains to verify them, and where they are lacking in accuracy or fidelity he gives evidence against the writers, but without animosity. Equally admirable, because of their judiciousness throughout, are the notes which accompany the portion of the work devoted to a sketch of the history of Moral Theology. A good example of the author's objectiveness, if we may adopt a favorite expression of the German philosophers, is the note added to the mention on St. Alphonsus (pag. 113). Dr. Bouquillon gives to the saint great

praise as a safe arbiter between different contending theological schools.

In a foot note we find the following:

"In refenrece to the *method* of St. Alphonsus, we may say that his theology is simply a commentary to the Medulla of Herman Busenbaum. Such the author himself shows it to be not only by making use of this title, but also in retaining the arrangement and disposition of parts as found in the original. Nevertheless, as a commentary it is entirely his own work, inasmuch as he follows the original in the same way as St. Thomas follows Aristotle, correcting, explaining, and adding to the text according to his own judgment. The holy Doctor himself expresses this in his preface to the reader when he says: 'Ut justa methodus servaretur, *medullam* Hermanni Busenbaum præmittendam censui, non jam ut omnes ipsius Auctoris opiniones approbarem, sed tantum ut ejusdem methodum sequerer, quæ inter aliorum auctorum methodos ad res morales exponendas valde accommodata mihi visa fuit.'—As to the *doctrine* of St. Alphonsus, it is derived from the casuists who preceded him, principally the Salmanticenses, as the Saint himself declares in the preface of his first edition: 'Alia explicanda, alia addenda censui (ad Busenbaum) ex diversis probatorum doctorum auctoritatibus, nimirum S. Thomæ, Lessii, Sanchez, Castropalai, Lugo, Laymann, Bonacina, Viva, Croix, Roncaglia et aliorum, præsertim Salmanticensium, qui communi æstimatione moralem hanc scientiam diffuse et egregie pertractant; quosque ipse inter cæteros frequentius familiares habui, *ita ut fere omnia quæ iidem tot libris latiore calamo in examen revocant, breviter concinnata hic invenias.*' Any one who compares the text of St. Alphonsus with that of the Salmanticenses will find that both works in most cases treat the same questions in the same order, giving the same solutions, the same arguments and authorities. If we enquire what was the special aim of St. Alphonsus in writing his work, we learn from the preface of it, and also from a letter addressed by him to Benedict XIV, that it was his purpose to publish a book on moral theology, which, whilst maintaining a middle course, would bring together in one, the best founded and most necessary teachings for the guidance of consciences. That he actually attained this end has been attested more than once by the Holy See.—And as regards, in fine, the merit of St. Alphonsus as a writer on Moral Theology, he excels rather in the wise choice among different opinions, and a deeply Christian instinct, than in depth of erudition or superiority of system; we may say, in one word, that in the matter of prudence (which he had mainly at heart) he outranks most others, whilst in the matter of strictly scientific exposition (to which portion of his work he could not, owing to the multitude of his duties, devote his full attention), many are superior to him."

We do not find anywhere a fairer estimate of the work and worth of St. Alphonsus as a theologian; and this is but one instance out of many displaying the solid and well-informed judgment of Dr. Bouquillon. No doubt the fact

that fully seventeen years have been allowed to pass between the first edition of the above work and the present, have given the author an opportunity of making valuable additions [1] to the latter, but it also assures us that, where there is question of mere opinion, and where moralists differ, we need not apprehend hasty and untried judgment here, but are likely to find well-matured wisdom. We have called attention only to the first portion of the book, treating of the introduction to the science of Moral Theology, because it seemed to us of special significance, but we hope to have occasion later on to give a critique of the main subject with which the volume deals, namely the *Theologia moralis fundamentalis.* Father Lehmkuhl—no slight authority in this case—has said of the author's first edition, as of his other works on special theology, *egregie scripsit.* We can hardly expect, then, to find fault with this work, perfected as we have it now. Nevertheless, a detailed review may prove welcome to many.

OFFICES OF TITULARS IN THE UNITED STATES.

JULY.

I. VISITATION OF THE B. V. MARY (JULY 2).

(*Twenty two Churches in* 1888.)

Jul. 1. Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.—*Jesu, tibi sit gloria* per tot. oct.
Pro Clero Romano, idem.

2, Fer. 4. *Alb.* Visitatio B. M. V. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. off. ut in Breviar. omis. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. Lect. 8. terminatur ad verb. *custodisse* et 9. incip. *Non enim.* Miss. ut in Calend. sine com. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.
Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

3, Fer. 5. Alb. S. Leon II. Semid. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. Visit. et SS. Apost. in Laud. et Miss. omiss. or. *Concede* Præf. B. M. V. Vesp. a cap. de Oct. Visit. com. præc. et Oct. Apost.

[1] We have been unable to obtain the first edition in order to make a comparison.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Paul. I. Dupl. ut in Calend. et supra Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et 2. Octt.

4, Fer. 6. *Alb.* de die 3. infr. Oct. Visit. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. *Novum ferit Dominus* ex Octavar. vel Breviar. 11. Sept. vel *Dei Filius* de commun. B. M. V. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. propr. vel ut in fest. com. Oct. in Laud. et Miss. in qua Gl. Cr. 3. or. de Spir. S. Præf. B. M. V. Vesp. de seq. com. 2. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Irenæi ut in Calend. et heri. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et 2. Octt.

5, Sabb. ut in Calend. et Fer. 5. In 2. Vesp. omit. com. Oct. Visitat.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

6, Dom. ut in Calend. Nihil fit de Oct. Visitat.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

7, Fer. 2. *Alb.* de die 6. infr. Oct. Visitat. ut Fer. 6. præc. Lect. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Hilarem video* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. pr. vel ut in fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, B. Benedicti XI. ut in Calend. et Fer. 5. præc. cum com. Oct. Visit. tant. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et Oct.

8, Fer. 3, S. Elizabeth Semid. com. Oct. in Laud. et Miss. in qua Gl. Cr. Præf. B. M. V. 3. or. de Spir. S. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1 Vesp. fest.) com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, B. Eugenii III. ut in Calend. et Fer. 2.

9, Fer. 4. *Alb.* Octava Visitationis B. M. V. Dupl. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ut in Octavar. *Fuit vir* vel ut in fest. 3. oct. ex Octavar. pr. vel ut in fest. Miss. ut in fest. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.—Fest. Prodigior. B. M. V. permanent. transferend. in 7. Sept. nisi antehac fuerit superiori die fixum.

II. SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS (JULY 5).

(*Eight Churches in* 1888.)

Jul. 4, Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

Jul. 5, Sabb. *Alb.* SS. Cyrilli et Methodii Epp. Conf. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. off. C. P. ut in Calend. sine com. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. diei Oct. SS. Apost. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

6, Dom. ut in Calend. Nihil fit de Oct. nisi com. in 2. Vesp.

Pro Clero Romano, idem sine com. Oct. in 2. Vesp.

7, Fer. 2. *Alb.* de 3. die infr. Oct. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Cum primum* sed omn. in numer. plural. vel ex Breviar. *Ad sanctorum* (ex 2. Noct. de commun. sed in num. plur.) 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Missis autem* vel ut in fest. Miss. de fest. cum Gl. Cr. 2. or. B. M. V. 3. pro Eccles. vel pro Papa. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

8, Fer. 3. S. Elizabeth Semid. Omitt. suffr. et Prec. Com. Oct. in Laud et Miss. in qua 3. or. B. M. V. et Cr. Vesp. a cap. de Oct. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, B. Eugenii III. ut in Calend. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. præc. et Oct.

9, Fer. 4. *Alb.* de 5. die infr. Oct. Lect. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Et homines* (num. plur. *quales Cyr. et Method.* ad fin. 6. Lect.) vel ex Breviar. *Beati Patris N.* (sed in Plur.) 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si quem* vel ut in fest. Reliqua ut Fer. 2. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

10, Fer. 5. SS. Sept. Fratrum Semid. ut Fer. 3. Vesp. a cap. de Oct. com. præc. et S. Pii Pap. M.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Vesp. de seq. com præc. et Oct.

11, Fer. 6. *Alb.* de 7. die infr. Oct. Lect. 2. Noct. ex Breviar. *Beatorum Patrum* vel si fer. 4. lectæ fuerint ex Octavar. *Tantum debet* vel ex Breviar. *Ad sanctorum* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ipse Dominus* vel ut in fest. Reliq. ut fer. 2. cum com. S. Pii I. Vesp. de Oct. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. SS. Mart.—Fest. S. Joan. Gualb. perman. mutand. in 21. Julii.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Pii Dupl. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

12, Sabb. *Alb.* Octava SS. Cyril. et Method. Dupl. Lect. 2. Noct.

ex Octavar. *Tantum debet* vel si heri lectæ fuerint ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. Miss. ut in fest. cum com. SS. Mart. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. et S. Anacleti.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et Dom.—Fest. S. Joan. Gualb. permanent. mutand. in 7. Sept. nisi antehac fuerit superius fixum.

III. THE MOST PRECIOUS BLOOD (JULY 6).

(*Eleven Churches in* 1888.)

Jul. 5. Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

6, Dom. 6. post. Pent. *Rub.* Fest. Pretiosiss. Sanguin. D. N. J. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. ut in Calend. sed sine com. Oct. Apost.—Præf. Cruc. per tot. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom.

7, Fer. 2. *Rub.* de die 2. infr. Oct. Semid. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. Reliq. ut in fest. 2. or. de B. M. V. 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, B. Benedicti XI. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. Cr. et Præf. Cruc. (per tot. Oct. except. fer. 4.). Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et Oct.

8, Fer. 3. S. Elizabeth. Semid. ut infr. Oct. SS. Cyr. et Method. Vesp. a cap. de Oct. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, B. Eugenii III. ut in Calend. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. Præc. et Oct.

9, Fer. 4. *Rub.* de die 4. infr. Oct. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. reliq. ut in fest. 2. or. de B. M. V. 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

10, Fer. 5. SS. Sept. Fratrum Semid. ut Fer. 3. Vesp. a cap. de Oct. com. præc. et S. Pii Pap. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Oct.

11, Fer. 6. *Rub.* de die 6. infr. Oct. ut Fer. 4. sed 2. or. S. Pii 3. de B. M. V. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Pii Dupl. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

12, Sabb. S. Joan. Gualb. Dupl. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr. Vesp. a cap. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. præc. Dom. et S. Anacleti.—*De hoc fit ut simplex.*

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. S. Anaclet. (*de hoc fit ut simpl.*) et Dom.

13, Dom. *Rub.* Octava Pretiosiss. Sanguin. Dupl. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. Reliq. ut in festo (Lectt. special. in 2. Noct. pro Congr. Miss. et Pret. Sang. in supplem. Octavar.) 9. Lect. de hom. Dom. ejus com. et. S. Anaclet. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. Dom. et S. Anacleti.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. S. Anaclet. et Dom.

IV. S. KILIAN (July 8).

(*Six Churches in* 1888.)

Jul. 7, Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.—Fest. S. Elizabeth. perpetuo mutand. in 11 Julii.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Fest. B. Eugen. perpet. mutand. in 7. Sept. nisi antehac fuerit fixum.

8, Fer. 3. *Rub.* S. Kiliani Ep. M. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. omnia de commun. unius Pont. Mart. 1 loc. Miss. *Statuit. or. Infirmitatem.* Cr. per tot. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. *Jesu, tibi sit gloria.*

9, Fer. 4. *Rub.* de 2. die. infr. Oct. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Clarum tanti* vel ex Breviar. *Principes* 3. Noct. ex. Octavar *Ut autem,* vel ut in fest. In Miss. 2. or. de B. M. V. 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Oct.

10, Fer. 5. *Rub.* SS. Sept. Fratr. ut in Calend. 2. or. com. Oct. 3. de B. M. V. omitt. Suffr. et Prec. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. Oct. et S. Pii I. (or. *Deus qui nos*).

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Vesp. de seq. (or. *Deus qui nos*) com. præc. et Oct.

Jul. 11, Fer. 6. *Alb.* S. Elizabeth Vid. (fix. ex 8. hujus) Semid. ut in Calend. 8. Jul. sine suffr. et prec. 2. or. Oct. 3. S. Pii cujus 9. Lect. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. Oct. et SS. Nabor. et Felic.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Pii Dupl. ut in Calend. (*Deus qui nos*) cum com. Oct. Vesp. a cap de seq. com. præc. Oct. et SS. Nabor. et Felic.

12, Sabb. S. Joann. Gualb. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

13, Dom. *Alb.* de Dom. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. post com. S. Anaclet. tant. sine Suffr. et Prec.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Anacleti ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

14, Fer. 2. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. Vesp. a cap. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. præc.—Fest. S. Henrici pro Calend. gener. permanent. mutand. in 21. Julii et pro Clero Rom. in 13. Sept. nisi jam superius fixum.

15, Fer. 3. Octavar. S. Kiliani Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Tempus* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sumptus* vel ut in fest. Reliq. ut in fest. Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

V. ST. JOHN GUALBERT (July 12).

(*One Church in* 1888.)

Jul. 11, Pro utroq. Clero. Vesp. de seq. sine com.

12, Sabb. S. Joann. Gualberti Abb. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Beatus vir.* Reliq. ut in Calend. cum. Cr. (per. tot. Oct). In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. In 2. Vesp. Com. S. Anaclet. et Dom.

Infr. Oct. ut in Calend. com. Oct. omiss. Suff. et Prec. et cum Cr. in Miss. In semid. 3. or. de B. M. V. Jul. 18. Vesp. a cap. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) Com. præc.—Fest. S. Vincent. permanent. mutand. in 21. Julii.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Fest. S. Symmachi permanent. mutand. in 2. Sept. nisi superius jam fuerit fixum.

19, Sabb. *Alb.* Octava S. Joann. Gualb. Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Ocatvar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. Reliq. ut

in fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com præc. Dom. et S. Margar.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VI. ST. BONAVENTURE (July 14).

(*Eleven Churches in* 1888.)

Jul. 13, Pro utroq. Clero. Vesp. de seq. Nulla. com.

14, Fer. 2. *Alb.* S. Bonaventuræ Ep. C. D. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

Infr. Oct. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. omiss. Suff. et Prec. et cum Cr. in Miss. In semid. 3. or. de B. M. V.

20, Dom. Vesp. a cap. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com præc. Dom. et S. Praxedis.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.—Fest. S. Alex. ulterius figend. prima die libera, quæ nunc est 7. Sept.

21, Fer. 2. *Alb.* Octava S. Bonaventuræ Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sollicitissime* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Lucent* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Praxed. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VII. ST. HENRY (July 15).

(*Twenty-two Churches in* 1888.)

14, Vesp de seq. (m. t. v.) Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

15, Fer. 3. *Alb.* S. Henrici Imper. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. ritu Dupl. cum Lectt. 1. Noct. *Justus* et Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.—*Jesu, tibi sit gloria.*

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Infr. Oct. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr. omiss. Suffr. et Prec. in semid. in quo 3. or. de B. M. V.

21, Fer. 2. *Alb.* de 7. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sancti* vel ex Breviar. *Beati* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Discumbenti* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Praxed. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. 3. or. B. M. V. Cr. Vesp. Dup. ut 1.

Vesp. fest.—Fest. S. Mar. Magd. permanent. mutand. in 27. Julii.

Pro Clero Romano, de S. Alex. Dupl. cum com. Oct. Vesp a cap. de seq. ut in 1. Vesp. com. præc.—Fest. S. Mar. Magd. permanent. mutand. in 7. Sept. nisi antehac prius fuerit fixum.

22, Fer. 3. *Alb.* Octava. S. Henrici Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si istum* vel ut in fest. Miss. fest. cum Cr. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et S. Liborii.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VIII. OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL (July 16).

(*Thirty-six Curches in* 1888.)

Jul. 15, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.—*Jesu, tibi sit gloria* per. tot. Oct.

16. Fer. 4. *Alb.* Fest B. M. V. de Monte Carmel. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fer. 5. 6. Sabb. Dom. (Fer. 2. pro Clero Romano) Fer. 3. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr. omiss. Suffr. et Prec. in semid. in quo 3. or. de Spirit. S.

21, Fer. 2. *Alb.* de die 6. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Hilarem* vel ex Breviar. *Dei Filius* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. 5. die infr. oct. B. M. ad Nives *Errant* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Praxed. in Laud. et Miss. in qua 3. or. de Spirit. S. Cr. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut indicatum supra.

22, Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp. fest.) com. præc. et S. Liborii.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Fest. S. Apollin. pro Calend. general. permanent. mutand. in 27. Jul. pro Cler. Rom. in 7. Sept. nisi jam anterius fixum.

23, Fer 4. *Alb.* Octava Fest. de Monte Carm. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Fuit vir* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. ad 12. Aug. de B. M. ad Nives vel ut in fest. Com. S. Libor. in Laud. et Miss. fest. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et S. Christinæ.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

IX. ST. VINCENT OF PAUL (JULY 19).

(*Fifty-seven Churches in* 1888.)

July 18, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. m. t. v. Nulla com.—Fest. S. Symmachi pro Clero Rom. perpetuo mutand. in 13. Augusti.

19, Sabb. *Alb.* S. Vincent. a Paul. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Justus.* Reliq. ut in Calend. Cr. per tot. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

20, Dom. ut in Calend. pro utroq. cler. cum com. Oct.

21, Fer. 2. *Alb.* de die 3. infr. Oct. semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ad hanc* vel ex Breviar. *Beati.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Prædicatori* (de Evangelist.) vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Praxed. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. cum Cr. 3. or. de B. M. V. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Alexii ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. Fer. 3, 4, 5, et 6. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. cum Cr. et (except. fest. S. Jacob.) com. Oct.

26, Sabb. S. Annæ Dupl. 2. cl. ut in Calend. cum com. diei Octav. S. Vincent. in Laud. et Vesp. et Cr. in Miss.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

X. ST. MARY MAGDALEN (JULY 22).

(*Sixteen Churches in* 1888.)

Jul. 21, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. sine com.

22, Fer. 3. *Alb.* S. Mariæ Magdal. Pœnit. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. In. 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Per totam Oct. pro utroq. Cler. ut in Calend. cum Cr. et (except. fest. S. Jac. et S. Ann.) com. Oct. et omiss. Suffr. et Prec. In Dom. color *Alb* et omitt. 3. or.

28, Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart.—Fest. S. Marthæ perpet. mutand. in diem seq. Fest. S. Felic. pro Clero Rom. in 7. Sept. nisi superius jam fixum.

29, Fer. 3. *Alb.* Octava S. Mar. Magd. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Duplicia* (nec Virg. nec Mart.)

vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. prop. vel ut in fest. Com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. cum Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart.

30, S. Marthæ. Semid. ut heri.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Marth. Dupl. ut in Calend.

XI. ST. LIBORIUS (JULY 23).

(*Three Churches in* 1888.)

Fest. S. Apollin. perpetuo mutand. in 27 Julii; pro Clero Rom. in 7. Sept. nisi jam antehac fixum.

Jul. 22, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. nulla com.

23, Feria 4. *Alb.* S. Liborii Ep. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Off. tot. de commun. Conf. Pont. 1. loc. Miss. *Statuit* cum Gl. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

24, Pro utroq. Cler. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

25, et 26. nihil fit de Oct.

27, Dom. 9. post. Pent. *Rub.* S. Apollinaris Ep. Mart. Dupl. (fix. ex 23 Julii) Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. lib. 4. Reg. 9. Lect. de hom. Dom. et hujus com. Oct. et S. Pantal. in Laud. et Miss. pr. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. seq. et Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

28, et 29. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. 3. or. de B. M. V. et omiss. Suffr. et Prec.

29, Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart.

30, Fer. 4. *Alb.* Octava S. Liborii Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octav. *Tantum* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Datur* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.—Fest. S. Marthæ ulterius mutand. in 13. Sept. nisi jam anterius fixum.

XII. ST. FRANCIS SOLANO (JULY 24).

(*Five Churches in* 1888).

Jul. 23, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. m. t. v. sine com.

24, Fer. 5. *Alb.* S. Francisci Solan. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Justus* 2, et 3. Noct. ut in Breviar. Miss. pr. Cr. Nihil de Vigil. et de S. Christin. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

25, et 26. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. sine com. Oct.

27, Dom. *Alb.* de ea. Semid. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. ante com. S. Mart. in Laud. (omiss. Suffr. et Prec.) et Miss. (omitt. or. *A Cunctis*) In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

28, et 29. (et 30. pro Clero Romano) ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et in semid. omiss. Suffr. et Prec. 3. or. de B. M. V.

29, Vesp. a cap. de Oct. com. præc. et SS. Mart.

30, Fer. 4. *Alb.* de die 7. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 2. Noct. *Sancti* ex Octavar. vel *Beatus* ex Breviar. 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.)—Fest. S. Ignat. permanent. mutand. in 9. August.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc.—Fest. S. Ignat. permanent. mutand. in 7. Sept. nisi jam antehac fixum.

31, Fer. 5. *Alb.* Octava S. Francisc. Solani Dupl. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. Miss. ut fest. Vesp. de seq. com. S. Paul. præc. et SS. Machab.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

XIII. ST. JAMES THE GREAT (JULY 25).

(*One hundred and fifteen Churches dedicated to St. James, nearly all to St. James the Great; among them the cathedral of Brooklyn and the pro-cathedral of Jamestown.*)

Jul. 24, Pro utroq. Cler. Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

25, Fer. 6. *Rub.* S. Jacobi Ap. Dupl. 1. cl. ut in Calend. sine com. S. Christoph.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

26, Nihil de Oct.

Jul. 27, 28, 29, et 31. ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct. cum com. Oct. et 3. or. de B. M. V. loco *A Cunctis.* In Dom. color *Rub.* et omit. 3. or.

29, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, In 2. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et Oct.

30, Fer. 4. *Rub.* de 6. die infr. Oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Quæ sunt* vel ex Breviar. *Scriptum est.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Credendum* (prop.) vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

31, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et SS. Mart.—Fest. S. Petr. ad Vinc. perpetuo mutand. in 9. August.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Fest. S. Petr. perpetuo mutand. in 7. Sept.

Aug. 1, Fer. 6. *Rub.* Octav. S. Jacobi Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Breviar. 2. loc. *Fundamenta* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Unde* (pr.) vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

XIV. ST. ANN (JULY 26).

(*One hundred and nineteen Churches in* 1888.)

Jul. 25, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

26, Sabb. *Alb.* S. Annæ Matris B. M. V. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. cum Cr. per tot. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom. tant.

27, 28, 29, 31. Aug. 1. (et 30 Julii pro Clero Rom.) ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct. cum com. Oct. et 3. or. B. M. V. loco *A Cunctis.*

30, Fer. 4. *Alb.* de die 5. inf. Oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Operatur* vel ex Breviar. *Agrum hunc.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Perpendis* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct.

Aug. 1, In 2. Vesp. com. S. Paul. seq. ut in 1. Vesp. fest. et S. Stephan. —Fest. S. Alphons. perpet. mutand. in 9. Aug.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.—Fest. S. Stephan. perpet. mutand. in 7. Sept. nisi jam superius fixum.

2, Sabb. *Alb.* Octava S. Annæ Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Duplicia* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ideo* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Stephan. in Laud. et Miss. fest. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. et Invent. S. Stephan.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Vesp. a cap. de seq. et reliq. ut in Calend.

XV. ST. IGNATIUS LOYOLA (JULY 31).

(*Thirty-one Churches in* 1888.)

Jul. 30, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

31, Fer. 5. *Alb.* S. Ignatii Loyol. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Beatus vir.* Cr. per tot. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et S. Paul. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Per tot. Oct. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct. cum com. Oct. omiss. die Dom. Suffr. et Prec. et or. *A Cunctis.*

7. Fer. 5. *Alb.* Octava S. Ignatii Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. de Evangelist. vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Donat. in Laud. et Miss. fest. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fest. S. Cajetan. perpetuo mutand. in 9. August., et pro Clero Rom. in 7. Sept. nisi prius jam fixm.

H. GABRIELS.

CONFERENCE.

Privileges after the Division of a Diocese.

Qu. U., originally a part of the Diocese of S., becomes a new Diocese. In the Diocese of S. the clergy have the privilege of saying two Requiem Masses every week. This privilege extends back for years before the separation of U. from S.

1. Did the privilege cease for the clergy in U. after the division took place?

2. For a continuation of the privilege, was it necessary that it should be so stated in the Faculties of the Bishop of U.?

Resp. If the terms of the above privilege granted to the Bishop of S. do not expressly restrict its application, it would appear from general principles in canon law that it continues in force after the division of the Diocese, unless changed or revoked by the new Bishop. Nor is it necessary for the continuance of this privilege that it be expressly mentioned in the Faculties of the new Bishop. This, however, refers to those priests only (salvo peritorum judicio) who were actually in possession of the privilege at the time of the division of the Diocese, and not to those who may be received in or ordained for the new Diocese afterwards. For the privilege—assuming that the wording of it does not state otherwise—was originally granted to the Diocese as a "corpus morale" and not as a geographical territory. For the priests of that diocese it was what is called a "gratia facta," that is, it obtained its force as soon as issued and independent of subsequent delegation. Of such privileges the principle holds good: "non expirat morte aut mutatione delegantis." The clergy who once belonged to this moral body, but ceased to do so, nevertheless retain the privilege, because "semel concessa non expirat mutatione delegantis," and according to the general principle, "Lex favorabilis ampliationem etiam congruentem exigit." But further than this we do not think it applies, since: "Privilegium non est extendendum ad alias personas vel causas ob similitudinem rationis." It would, of course, be different if the privilege had been obtained in favor of the entire province, in which case it must have been the intention of the authority who granted it to benefit all the dioceses, present or future, within the metropolitan jurisdiction. The same would hold good in cases where the Bull of erection of the new diocese states that all former customs and privileges are to be retained.—

Cf. Grandclaude: Jus can., Vol. I., p. 155; *Vol. III., p.* 489; *Ballerini: Opus, Vol. I., Tr. iii., c.* 4; *Konings: Vol. I., n.* 151; *Bouquillon: Theol. Fundam., n.* 130, *p.* 311.

The Orations at Benediction of the M. Bl. Sacrament.

Qu. There are different customs in various churches as to the number and kind of collects chanted by the celebrant during Benediction of the M. Bl. Sacrament. Some add to the ordinary oration "Deus qui nobis" the prayer to the S. Heart, others that of the Patron of the Church, and so forth. Is there any obligation to say any others except the above-mentioned oration to the Bl. Sacrament?

Resp. There is no obligation to recite any but the customary oration "Deus qui nobis," unless where the Ordinary of the Diocese has prescribed others.

The celebrant is at liberty to add other collects, such as may be suggested by the ecclesiastical season, place, special necessities, etc. Thus the oration of the Sacred Heart on the first Friday of the month, or of the patron saint of the church on Sundays, are quite proper. The "Imperata" which is obligatory at Mass is usually also added at Benediction, although there is no obligation unless the Ordinary has expressly made it such.

These prayers may be added at all times (even during Forty Hours' Devotion), *except on the feast and during the octave of Corpus Christi*, when the prayer of the Bl. Sacrament alone is to be said.

All the collects are to be said under a common conclusion, which is to be the *short* form *qui vivis et regnas in sæcula sæculorum.* The following is an answer of the S. Congregation of Rites to a similiar question.

Licere collectas addere post orationem SS. Sacramenti et collectas. . . . ordinandas ut ad proximum simul jungendas cum oratione brevi. [1]

Negative vero in festo et per octavam Corporis Christi. [2]

[1] Die 7 Sept. 1850.

[2] Die 22 Sept. 1837.

Pictures of the Sacred Heart.

Qu. Are pictures of the Sacred Heart by itself, without representing Our Lord, forbidden for purposes of private devotion?

Resp. No. As to what is licit and what is forbidden in regard to the representations of the Sacred Heart, consult the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. II., pag. 405.

Jubilee Celebration of Nuptials.

Qu. Is there any authorized form which a priest may adopt in blessing a married couple on occasion of the twenty-fifth or fiftieth anniversary of their nuptials?

Resp. Although the Roman Ritual does not contain a form of blessing especially set apart for the above-mentioned ceremony, there is no doubt that any suitable form of blessing and prayer, otherwise approved, may be used on this occasion. Such a one may be found in Fr. Lehmkuhl's edition of the *Manuale Sacerdotum*, pars II., pag. 430; also in Fr. Wapelhorst's *Compendium S. Liturgiæ*, n. 293, both of which are substantially the same (taken from *Instr. past.*, *Eystet*). The celebrant, vested in surplice and stole (white), addresses a brief exhortation, in which he sets forth the excellence of the bond that unites the married couple and bids them renew it under the blessing of God, etc. He then places the end of the stole upon their joined hands, and blessing them, says: *Benedictio Dei omnipotentis Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti descendat super vos et maneat semper. Amen.* Then he recites Psalm cxxvii., *Beati omnes*, etc., with the antiphon *Ecce sic benedicetur homo qui timet Dominum.* Next follow the Versicles *Domine, exaudi orationem*, etc., *Dominus vobiscum*, then *Oremus.* Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, respice propitius super hos famulos tuos, ad templum sanctum tuum pro gratiarum actioni lætos accedentes, et præsta, ut post hanc vitam ad æternae beatitudinis gaudia (cum prole sua) pervenire mereantur. Per Christum, etc.

He then sprinkles them with blessed water.—If Mass is to be said, he vests for it, leaving the maniple on the step of the altar, and performs the ceremony as above. Then he says the Mass of the day, or, if the rubrics permit, one of the votive Masses.

ANALECTA.

EX S. CONGREGATIONE INDICIS.

Feria V die 6 Martii 1890.

Sacra Congregatio Eminentissimorum ac Reverendissimorum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalium a SANCTISSIMO DOMINO NOSTRO LEONE PAPA XIII Sanctaque Sede Apostolica Indici librorum pravæ doctrinæ, eorumdemque proscriptioni, expurgationi, ac permissioni in universa christiana Republica præpositorum et delegatorum, habita in Palatio Apostolico Vaticano die 6 Martii 1890, *mandavit et mandat, proscripsit proscribitque, vel alias damnata atque proscripta in Indicem librorum prohibitorum referri mandavit et mandat quæ sequuntur Opera:*

Mélanges sur Quelques Questions agitées de mon temps et dans mon coin de pays par J. M. Boillot, Curé de la Madeleine, de Besançon.—Besançon. Imprimerie et Litographie Dodivers et Cie., Grand-Rue, 87, et Rue Moncey, 8 *bis*—1888. —*Auctor laudabiliter se subjecit et Opus reprobavit.*

Judas de Keriot—Poema Dramatica de Frederic Soler de la Academia de la llengua catalana, Mestre en gay saber—Barcelona, Llibreria de I. Lopez, Editor—Rambla del Mitj, num. 20—1889.

Il Nuovo Rosmini — Periodico Scientifico-Letterario. — Milano, Tipografia Fratelli Rechiedei.—*Decr. S. Off. Fer. IV. die* 26 *Februarii* 1890.

Itaque nemo cujuscumque gradus et conditionis prædicta Opera damnata atque proscripta, quocumque loco, et quocumque idiomate, aut in posterum edere, aut edita legere vel retinere audeat, sed locorum Ordinariis, aut

hæreticæ pravitatis Inquisitoribus ea tradere teneatur sub pœnis in Indice librorum vetitorum indictis.

Quibus SANCTISSIMO DOMINO NOSTRO LEONI PAPÆ XIII per me infrascriptum S. I. C. a Secretis relatis SANCTITAS SUA Decretum probavit, et promulgari præcepit. In quorum fidem, etc.

Datum Romæ die 22 *Martii* 1890.

CAMILLUS Card. MAZZELLA *Præf.*

FR. HYACINTHUS FRATI, ORD. PRÆD.,

Loco ✠ Sigilli. S. Ind. Congreg. a Secretis.

Die 24 *Martii* 1890 *ego infrascriptus Mag. Cursorum testor supradictum Decretum affixum et publicatum fuisse in Urbe.*

VINCENTIUS BENAGLIA *Mag. Curs.*

IMPEDIMENTA BIGAMIÆ ET DISPARITATIS CULTUS.

Episcopus Wayne Castrensis quam humillime petit solutionem casus sequentis:

In Fœderatis Americæ Septentrionalis provinciis non raro evenit, aliquos ad fidem Catholicam convertere, qui antea matrimonio civili cum aliqua juncti erant et postea divortium civile obtinuerunt vel inire intendant. Certe prima quæstio solvenda est—eratne primum matrimonium validum tamquam contractus vel tamquam sacramentum? *Posito* tamen quod ex documentis et probationibus certis, a curia Episcopali et defensore matrimonii admissis, constat *primum matrimonium* vel propter bigamiam alterius partis vel propter cultus disparitatem *fuisse certe nullum, requirituine appellatio defensoris* et judicum, in secunda instantia a Benedicto XIV præscriptum in casibus de nullitate matrimonii in facie ecclesiæ initi? An sufficit, certe constare, primum matrimonium fuisse absolute nullum, ita ut nulla requiratur secunda instantia et judicium? Non est casus Apostoli, quia hic supponit matrimonium validum tamquam con-

tractus. Non est quæstio sanationis primi matrimonii, hoc non desiderant nec communiter possibile est.

Feria IV die 20 Martii 1889.

S. Congregatio S. Officii examinato suprascripto dubio et perpensis omnibus expositis facti circumstantiis, respondendum decrevit: Dummodo per processum saltem extrajudicialem certo constet de nullitate matrimonii ob præexistens dirimens impedimentum evidenter comprobatum—Negative.

SSmus D. N. Leo PP. XIII resolutionem S. Congregationis adprobavit.

J. MANCINI,
S. R. et Univ. C. Notarius.

BOOK REVIEW.

CURSUS SCRIPTURÆ SACRÆ auctoribus B. Cornely, Jos. Knabenbauer, Fr. de Hummelauer, aliisque Soc. Jesu Presbyteris. Commentarius in Ezechielem Prophetam auctore Jos. Knabenbauer, S. J. pp. 542. Parisiis, P. Lethielleux. (Pustet & Co.) 1890.

The most difficult portion of the Prophecy of Ezechiel, the real *crux interpretum*, as Fr. Cornely styles it, is undoubtedly that which begins at ch. xl. and continues to the close of the book; viz., the chapters wherein the new measurement and rites of the temple and the re-division of the Holy Land are described. It was at this point that St. Jerome closed his commentary on the Prophecy: *Hucusque in Ezechielem prophetam Deo ut optamus et credimus auxiliante et aperiente os nostrum locuti sumus. In ædificatione autem templi et ordine sacerdotum terræque sanctæ divisione ..... aperte imperitiam confitemur, melius arbitrantes interim nihil quam parum dicere.* Yielding, however, to the request of Eustochium, the Saint afterwards continued his commentary: "*et ego istarum Scripturarum ingressus oceanum et mysteriorum Dei.... labyrinthum, perfectam quidem scientiam veritatis mihi vindicare non audeo.*" And further on, "*hæc non frivola videantur esse lectori, licet et mihi ipsi qui dico displiceant sentiens me clausam pulsare januam.*" Mariana speaks in the same strain:

"*Postrema Ezechielis visio in templi fabrica consumitur omnium plane difficillima, ut inter noctis tenebras hallucinari lector videatur; hoc et antiquis Patribus contigit.*" It is in this part, too, that the different schools of exegesis stand in strongest opposition,—the historical, allegorical, symbolical (and typical), Judaistical, as the speaker's commentary ranges them, or as Fr. Knabenbauer divides them, the historical, (followed by eminent Catholic commentators, e. g., St. Ephraim, Cornelius a Lapide, Menochius, Calmet, etc.), rationalistic, chiliastic, and symbolical (followed by most orthodox exegesists). The Catholic historical school holds that the precepts laid down by the prophet regarding the temple and its service are to be taken literally as prescriptive for post-Exilian times. But, as Fr. K. very well shows (pp. 501, 504), (*a*) those precepts were never carried out after the Return, and cannot therefore have been understood as ritualistic precepts by the Jewish elders and prophets, nor were they revealed as such by God; (*b*) many regulations laid down by Ezechiel are at variance with the Mosaic law, which latter was in no wise changed after the Captivity.

Wellhausen and other rationalistic critics find in these chapters the beginnings of the famous "Priestly Code" and an argument for the fragmentary theory of the Pentateuch. Ezechiel, they maintain, is describing the ritual used in the Old Temple and prescribing its re-establishment in the New. What the prophet did during the Exile, was repeated by other priests in after days, and thus were introduced chs. xvii–xxvi of Leviticus. Later on the rites and ceremonies were increased and more determined, and thus gradually sprang up the "*Codex Sacerdotalis*," i. e., the collection of regulations contained in Ex. xxv–xl (except xxxii–xxxiv), Levit., Numb. i–x, xv–xix, xxv–xxxvi. Ezechiel therefore is said to stand midway between Deuteronomy and the "Priestly Code," so that in his work we may see the development of the Jewish ritual from Deuteronomy on, till it reaches its perfection in the above code. Wellhausen, Smend, *aliique id generis*, say that the "*Codex Sacerdotalis*" was first promulgated by Esdras and Nehemias. What tells strongly against this mutilation hypothesis, as Fr. K. shows at length, is that Esdras and Nehemias speak of the Mosaic law not as of recent origin, but as delivered by God through Moses to the people,—as *lex Moysi quam Dominus Deus dedit Israel*. This and kindred phrases testifying to the universal belief of priest and people in the ancient *Mosaic* origin of the Pentateuch occur

over and over again in Esdras and Nehemias. There is no reason to suppose thatt his universal belief sprang from a deception; nay, in view of the onerous nature of the law, the moral impossibility of such deception is quite apparent—Fr. K. cites a specimen of Wellhausen's arguments to show that the Mosaic law was unknown in the days of the Minor Prophets. It is based on Osee ii. 5 sqq., whence flows the inference: "*En tota religio omnisque pietas in id solum dirigitur, ut fruges terræ habeantur: minime vero ei subsunt res illæ quæ ad salutem Israel gestæ esse dicuntur: nullo pacto sollemnitatis quæ in codice sacerdotali describuntur conciliari possunt cum hoc cultu quem Osee nobis exhibet exerceri.*" "*O præclaram argumentationem!* remarks Fr. K. *Etiam nos petimus; ut fructus terræ dare et conservare digneris, te rogamus, audi nos! Ergo tota religio versatur in donis ac beneficiis terræ acquirendis, neque ei subsunt facta illa grandia supernaturalia*" (p. 507). It were, of course, unfair to infer that Wellhausen's theory rests entirely on such sophisms. But it shows at least into what absurdities even an erudite scholar may fall when he brings merely unaided reason to the study of revealed truth. Fr. K., of course, follows the symbolical and typical interpretation, and admirably shows that the main lines of the vision of the temple typify the Church, the temple built by the true Messiah. He does not, however, venture to carry the symbolism into details. This mode of interpretation is confirmed by a close comparison between the present prophecy and the Apocalyptic visions of St. John. Hæc in universum dici posse arbitror. *Magis descendere ad particularia non audeo, quia de singulis res est incerta an vel quid significent. Multa quidem ab aliquibus excogitata sunt; at quam salebrosa res sit singula velle mystice interpretari, ipsis illis explicationibus clarissime manifestatur. Neque enim pro tali singularum rerum enarratione normæ assignari possunt certæ . . . sed pro suo quisque ingenio ad arbitrium expatiatur libere. Quare alias opiniones et quandoque opinionum portenta alii proponunt. Immensum autem opinionum acervum augere vereor*" (p. 524). We consider this passage characteristic of this as well as of the other commentaries by the same author on the prophetic writings. Vast and many-sided erudition—philological, historical, exegetical,—is brought to bear in expounding the literal meaning of the sacred text, and that meaning, especially when brought in relation with truths elsewhere revealed, is shown to be full of deepest spiritual meaning, useful, as is *omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata, ad docendum, ad arguendum, ad corripiendum, ad erudiendum ad justitiam.*"

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND SOCIALISM. A solution of the social problem. By Conde B. Pallen, Ph.D.—St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder.

It is slightly overstating the truth, to say that Christ was the "first to introduce the teaching of God's and man's personality into the world" (pag. 13). The author, indeed, prepares us for the assertion by the previous comparison between the old Roman and the Christian doctrines regarding man; still, even if it were safe to assume that no pagan philosopher really believed in the personality of God or man, we surely cannot ignore the Jewish people, whose theocratic ideas were pronounced enough at the time of Our Lord's advent to leave their impress on pagan teaching, at least in individual cases.—The pamphlet is well written and timely, and deserves to be widely read.

MARRIAGE. Conferences delivered at Notre Dame, Paris. By V. Rev. P. Monsabré, O. P. Translated from the French by M. Hopper. New York, Cincinn., Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

These sermons of the erudite and eloquent Dominican are apt to do much good among the better educated of our laity. They are also of much use to priests who may have occasion to hold similar conferences on this burning subject, inasmuch as the author points out sources for apt material, apart from what he says with admirable grace, upon the Sanctity of Marriage, the Conjugal Tie, Divorce, Legislation on Marriage, Profanation of Marriage, Celibacy, and Virginity. At the end is to be found a good analysis of each of these chapters, preceded by an index of the principal errors contrary to the doctrines set forth in the conferences. There is an air of accurate theological learning pervading these pages, and the book will not be popular in the vulgar sense of the word. The mechanical portion of its get up is equally choice.

NATURAL RELIGION. From the "Apologie des Christenthums" of Franz Hettinger, D. D., Prof. of Theology, Wuerzburg. Edited, with an introduction on Certainty, by Henry Sebastian Bowden, of the Oratory.—Fr. Pustet & Co., New York, and Cincinnati, 1890.

At length the first volume of this much-desired translation has appeared. Nearly twenty years ago the gifted oratorian Father Dalgairns was preparing, so it was understood, a version in English of this great work by the German theologian, whose writings found such universal

appreciation among those who were able to read or understand them.

But nothing more was heard of Dr. Hettinger until Father Bowden gave us a sample of the author's exquisite literary power and wide erudition in his happy and judicious translation of the commentary on Dante's Divina Commedia. The same writer now edits the first part of the "Apologie" under the title of "Natural Religion." This is to be followed by another volume, entitled "Revealed Religion." The remaining three volumes deal with the Dogmatic portion as distinct from what is called "Evidences" of Christianity. Father Bowden omits in his translation whatever is local or may not harmonize with the genius of the English speaking world, for whom the translation is intended. This is proof of his eminent fitness for the task of translating. Fidelity is a fault when it is injudiciously applied. When we introduce a foreigner into our homes we demand of him not only that he adapt himself as far as may be to our capacity of understanding him, but we should think him out of place if he appealed constantly to persons and books well known to his own circle, but of no account outside of it. Hence many of the quotations from German authors, etc., are properly omitted by Fr. Bowden. On the other hand he supplies a gap in the work which would not be felt as such by the German readers. We allude to the introduction on "Certainty." The great intellectual and moral heresies that confront natural religion in Germany are Materialism and Pantheism. In England and America, infidelity presents itself in the guise of Agnosticism. As Dr. Hettinger makes no profession to meet the latter, it devolved on Father Bowden, in order ro render his work really useful and popular, to supply a chapter on the subject. This he does by way of preface, drawing freely from sources which are congenial to the general tone of the book, principally from Dr. Stoeckl and Kleutgen, the two great German philosophers of modern times.

The science of Apologetics is the chief weapon to be employed against secular infidelity of to-day. Dr. Hettinger fully realized this, and set himself to work to forge an apt sword in his "Apologetik," which differs from the work before us inasmuch as it collects and systematically arranges the principles which underlie the facts offered in the history of the Church, her Dogmas, and their development. Dr. Pohle, at the Catholic University, has taken up this branch of study in his lectures, and we confidently look for a text-book on the subject in English, in

the near future. Meanwhile we invite the attention of American students and all earnest thinkers to the excellent exposition of "Natural Religion" edited by Father Bowden. It is charming reading and beguiles the time with wise thoughts.

DE VITA ET HONESTATE CLERICORUM DISPUTATIUNCULA ex Commentariis in Concil. Plenar. Baltim. III. Privatis auditorum usibus extracta a Nicolao Nilles, S.J.—Oeniponte. Fel. Rauch (C. Pustet). 1890.

There is in the above study an implied recognitionof the practical excellence of American Canon Law as embodied in the Decrees of the Plenary Councils of Baltimore. The disputation is of course didactic in character, and will become valuable if continued. In the meantime we note with pleasure that the American students in Innsbruck are not likely to be neglected.

SACERDOTAL MEDITATIONS. By Rev. P. Chaignon, Translated from the eleventh edition of the French. Two Volumes. Montpelier, Vt., 1889.

We have frequently been asked to suggest some meditation book written in English for the use of secular priests, and have always found it difficult to point out one from among those which are current in the vernacular, suitable for our clergy. P. Chaignon, whose meditations had been recommended to us by a director of the Retreat for ordination, came indeed nearest to realize what we thought should be a meditation book for priests not religious, but there existed up to last year no English translation of the same. Bishop De Goesbriand's thoughtfulness and zeal has supplied this want, and we have these meditations now in two well-printed octavo volumes. Their advantage lies, as we have intimated, in this, that they are written principally for the use of the *secular clergy*, whilst the bulk of works of this kind are from and originally intended for the use of religious. Father Chaignon, it is true, was a Jesuit; but he labored almost exclusively among the secular clergy. For more than thirty years he was actively employed in giving retreats to priests, and he thus learned thoroughly to appreciate the difficulties and wants of those with whom he habitually conversed and whom he was especially called to sanctify.

The matter of these meditations is, as may be expected, excellent and

practical. It embraces the general duties and virtues of priests and the pastoral functions in particular. There are also meditations for the Sundays of the year, the principal mysteries of faith, and the great feasts, always with special application to the life of the secular priest.—The method is that of St. Ignatius, which, we may say, without disparaging the favorite one of St. Sulpice, produces in the shortest time the most practical results. A systematic and clear exposition of this method, as well as an outline of other kinds of prayer, may be found in the first volume of the above work. In treating of the feasts of the year, in the second volume, the author is constrained to depart somewhat from the manner of St. Ignatius, owing to the subject matter.

We unhesitatingly recommend this work to the secular clergy and to seminarians, and do not believe that those who have been obliged to use other meditation books in the English language will be disappointed in this. We understand that Bishop De Goesbriand has undertaken the entire responsibility of publication, and that only a limited edition has been printed. The book can be obtained by addressing the *Rev. Thos. Donahue, Bishop's House, Burlington, Vt.*

DIE WELTREICHE UND DAS GOTTESREICH nach den Weissagungen des Propheten Daniel. Von Franz Duesterwald, Director d. Erzb. Theol. Conv. zu Bonn.—Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder. 1890. St. Louis: B. Herder.

This is an able and thoroughly Catholic exposition of the prophecies of Daniel, adducing sound reasons to prove the authenticity of the book as well as its meaning. The historical predictions made by Daniel in the time of the Jewish captivity were so accurately fulfilled in the subsequent ages, that only one way was left open to the rationalist critics to destroy the force of this book as a supernatural testimony in favor of Christianity. They could not deny its existence as an historical document at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, for it is mentioned in the book of Maccabees; its authenticity was accepted in the Jewish Church, as is proved from its appearence in the Hebrew canon, and Josephus, who was himself much more of a rationalist than a Jew, bears unhesitating witness to the fact that this book must have existed before the time of Artaxerxes I. Strange enough, many Protestant scholars have followed the wake of the rationalistic school and done their best to endorse the argument against the authorship of the book by Daniel, which,

as St. Jerome tells us, had first been questioned by Porphyrius, in the third century. Our author not only vindicates the historic truth in this matter, but conclusively shows how the entire prophecy points to and finds its last fulfilment in the Catholic Church.

A MANUAL OF CATHOLIC THEOLOGY, based on Scheeben's "Dogmatik." by Joseph Wilhelm, D.D., Ph.D., and Thomas B. Scannell, B. D., with a preface by the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Vol. I. The sources of Theology, God, Creation, and the Supernatural Order. London: Kegan Paul; New York: The Cath. Publ. Soc. Co. 1890. pp. li—508.

We have not space in this number for an adequate notice of this important volume, but it forms so timely and valuable an addition to Catholic Theology, that we do not wish to delay bespeaking for it the patronage of our readers. Fr. Scheeben's work is too well known to theological students to require commendation here. The translators have followed the wise plan of adopting the *Dogmatik* to the conditions of English students, rather than of close translation, and it is no small praise to say that their version is worthy of the original. We shall return to the work in a future number.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The mention of Books under this head does not preclude further notice of them in subsequent numbers.

CONSECRATION OF THE DIOCESE OF ST. CLOUD TO THE MOST SACRED HEART OF JESUS. Pastoral Letter of the Rt. Rev. Otto. Zardetti, D.D., Bishop of St. Cloud, addressed to the clergy and the faithful of his diocese. (English and German.)

MONTH OF THE SACRED HEART for the Young Christian. By Brother Philippe. Transl. from the French by E. A. Mulligan.—New York, Cinc., Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

THE IMMACULATE HEART OF MARY. From the Italian by Fr. John Peter Pinamonti, S. J., (Quarterly Series of the Sacred Heart Library). 1890. Philad., 114. S. Third Str.

VENI SANCTE SPIRITUS. Short Meditations from the Ascension to the Octave of Corpus Christi. By Richard F. Clarke, S. J.—New York, Cinc., Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

HANDBUECHLEIN FUER MINISTRANTEN zu den gewoehnlichen kirchlichen Verrichtungen in den Pfarrkirchen. Zweite Auflage.—Regensburg, New York, and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

THE LEPER QUEEN. A story of the Thirteenth Century.—New York, Cinc., Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

AIDS TO CORRECT AND EFFECTIVE ELOCUTION, with selected Readings and Recitations for practice. By Eleanor O'Grady.—New York, Cinc., Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

CANTORINUS ROMANUS seu collectio compendiosa cantionum ecclesiasticarum quas editiones typicæ S. R. C. Missalis, Ritualis, et Pontificalis Romani continent ad instructionem cantum choralem discentium edita.—Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci, et Cincinnatii. Sumptibus Friderici Pustet, 1890.

REVELATIONS OF THE SACRED HFART to Bl. Margaret Mary, and the History of her Life. From the French of Mgr. Bougand, Bishop of Laval. By a Visitandine of Baltimore. New York, Cinc., Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

THE NEW SECOND READER. By the Rt. Rev. Richard Gilmour, D. D. New York, Cinc., Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

GENERAL METAPHYSICS. By John Rickaby, S.J. (Manuals of Catholic Philosophy—Stonyhurst series). New York, Cinc., Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1890.

AN ESSAY CONTRIBUTING TO A PHILOSOPHY OF LITERATURE. By Brother Azarias. Sixth Edition, Revised and Enlarged.—New York: P. O'Shea, 45 Warren Str. 1890.

RATIONAL RELIGION. By Rev. John Conway. Second Edition.—Milwaukee: Hoffmann Bros. 1890.